NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VII.---NO. 42. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1847. WHOLE NUMBER 354.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,

BY THE

AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.

At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum; Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Communications.

LETTER FROM MR. GOODELL.

MR. EDITOR.—Your printers have made a mistake in my article, in the Standard of the 11th instant. I spoke of the "*criticism*," [not "*witticism*,"] of Mr. Adams, on "the clause of the Constitution concerning persons held to service and labour."

Mr. Phillips treats rather contemptuously the doctrine I advanced, that the Divine authority is paramount to the human. It was "the clergyman's blunder" to bring moral considerations or "the right of private judgment into the arena of civil law where it is an absurdity." And again, says he,

"It is a very *plausible* theory, and *may* be a very sound one, that no Government can, in the eye of God rightfully exist, without possessing the power to execute justice between man and man. Every one is *at liberty* to adopt it, *if it strikes him favourably*."

And again [after quoting from my pamphlet] he says:

"The reader will notice in these quotations the evidence of that, the clergyman's frequent error, (to which we have before adverted,) of deceiving oneself with the ambiguity concealed under the word *law*:—law for instance, in its first broad meaning, standing for the rule which God and nature point out and sanction, as proper and rightful; and *law*, secondly, the rule which certain individuals, constituting the majority, have arranged, shall be the settled plan of their society."

In answer to this, I might repeat over again, the quotations which I made, from standard writers of common law, affirming the proposition, in the very same words I used.* And I might ask whether Coke, Blackstone, Fortescue, and Noyes, had fallen into "the clergyman's frequent error."† But I will vary the proof, by citing the words of one of the ablest lawyers in England, who, I believe, is no "clergyman." Quite remarkable is it that I clip this testimony from the same number of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, (Nov. 5) that contains a portion of the criticisms of Mr. Phillips:

From the Tribune.

TEXTS FOR THE DAY.

We take the liberty of advising religious people who are fond of quoting the Bible in extenuation of Slavery, and who think that George Kirk ought to be sent back to Georgia, to read this morning, at family prayers, the following verses in Deut. xxiii. 15, 16:

"Thou shalt not deliver unto the master the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee: He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of the gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him."

As to those *legal quibblers* who esteem human above Divine authority, whose talk is of legal precedents, enactments, and compacts, and who would give to Slavery its pound of flesh, even if in so doing they must tear away the soul of Freedom, we commend to their notice the following passage from Brougham:

"Tell me not of rights—talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves. I deny the right—I acknowledge not the property. The principles, the feelings, of our common nature, rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of laws that sanction such a claim! There is a law above all the enactments of human codes—the same throughout the world, the same in all times—it is the law written by the finger of God on the heart of man; and by that law, unchangeable and eternal, while men despise fraud, and loathe rapine, and abhor blood, they shall reject with indignation the wild and guilty fantasy, that man can hold property in man!"

Now, I should like to know whether this is quoted as a mere flourish of *rhetoric*? Brougham uttered it as a principle of *law*, and he affirmed, as strongly as I have done, the doctrine that Slavery is *illegal*. How happens it, that those are mere "*legal quibblers*" who deny the doctrine I advanced, except in the case of Mr. Wendell Phillips and his associates, when they have occasion to defend the constitutionality of American Slavery? How is it, Mr. Editor, that you can commend the "admirable leading article of Wendell Phillips on the Constitution," containing the legal quibbles condemned by Brougham, and then copy, with apparent approbation, the *reproofs* which Brougham administers upon such quibbles? Are all the principles laid down by the Abolitionists in general in both Hemispheres, to be *reversed*, in order to make out the constitutionality of American Slavery?

So it would seem. I have shown in the Albany Patriot,) as my prescribed limits forbid my doing in the Standard,) that the leading *principles* of Weld's Power of Congress over the District of Columbia, a work so universally admired by all Abolitionists, *until recently*, are denied or derided by Mr. Phillips, particularly the principles so copiously affirmed by our most eminent jurists, that the *common law* retains its authority, as the basis of our American Constitutions; that same common law whose presence Mr. Phillips admits to be the death warrant of Slavery.

Let me not be again misunderstood. I do not say that Mr. Weld proved the unconstitutionality of American Slavery. He had not *that* point in view. But I *do* say that the *principles* by which he proved the power of Congress, over the District of Columbia, are important links in the chain of my reasoning against the constitutionality of American Slavery. Grant me these principles, and my conclusions cannot be avoided. This Mr. Phillips understands, and *therefore* he *contradicts* those principles, and speaks sneeringly of "the opinion of Mr. T. D. Weld." Whenever the doctrines of Mr. Phillips shall be received by Abolitionists, they will have to find *new* arguments and *new* champions for "the Power of Congress over the District of Columbia," or give up *that* vantage ground, now so commonly conceded to them.

I do not say that the general doctrine of the illegality of Slavery is identical with the proposition that affirms the Anti-Slavery character of the Constitution of 1789. But I *do* say that if there *was no* legal Slavery, prior to that date, the Constitution could not and did not guaranty *a legal nonentity*. It neither created Slavery nor gave to it a validity which it had not before. I say, further, that since there was no legal Slavery in existence at that time, (not only because Slavery *cannot* be legal, but because the legal decision of 1772 and the Constitutional Declaration of 1776 had confirmed its illegality,) then the ambiguous phraseology of the Constitution of 1789, (if it *be* ambiguous,) which makes no *mention* of Slavery, is to be construed in favour of liberty and of moral right, in accordance with the known principles of legal interpretation. If Mr. Phillips would meet the arguments I *made*, instead of those I did *not* make, he must show how Slavery could be legal previous to 1789, under the decision of 1772, and the Declaration of 1776, the same delaration of inalienable rights that abolished Slavery (by judicial decision) in Massachusetts. Or else he must show how the Constitution of 1789 *made* Slavery legal when it was not before.

Mr. Phillips thinks it a sufficient evidence of the soundness of my constitutional doctrines, that they differ from those which are commonly received. But *his* constitutional doctrines differ, likewise, from those commonly received. He may claim, to be sure, that he reaches the *conclusion* commonly held in respect to the constitutionality of *Slavery*. But in order to reach that conclusion by anything like a logical process of reasoning; or rather, in order to parry off my arguments *against* the constitutionality of *Slavery*, he finds himself obliged to deny to the Federal Constitution the general characteristics always attributed to it; and even to make it the *reverse* of what it is commonly supposed to be. Not one of its republican features, so far as *principles* are concerned; not one of its safeguards of general liberty, for the white man, do his expositions permit to remain. The *pro*-slavery champions of constitutional Slavery, taking their conclusions for granted, had conveniently avoided the argument. Their *anti*-slavery successors find the task all on their hands. How hard a task it is, Mr. Phillips's effort shows. He admits that the intentions of the *people* who adopted the Constitution, and not the intentions of the *framers*, so-called, are to give character to that document—a concession, by the by, quite fatal to some of his own reasonings, and absolutely reducing to blank waste paper a certain pamphlet founded on "the Madison Papers," and sent forth by the American Anti-Slavery Society, some time ago. For what could the people, adopting the Constitution of 1789, know of the proceedings of a secret convention, revealed only to the *next generation* by the "Madison Papers" after his death?

Mr. Phillips's exposition not merely makes our forefathers knaves. Not content with this, it supposes them, likewise, to have been fools. Not only did they fail to secure the rights of their neighbours: They failed too, and with their eyes wide open, to obtain a single guaranty of their *own* freedom. More than this. They did not even *intend* to do it. For the *intentions of the people*, says Mr. Phillips, settles the meaning. Very well. And what does he suppose they *intended*?

The Preamble to their Constitution says they intended "*to establish justice*, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, and secure the blessings of liberty to (themselves and their) posterity."

There is no ambiguity here. The *words* are sufficiently explicit. But, according to Mr. Phillips, they intended no such thing! If they *had* thus intended, their "intention" would have decided the meaning of the Constitution to have been in accordance with this intention. Then, there could be no constitutional Slavery, until Slavery could be shown to be in accordance with "justice" and "liberty." But this would not suit the argument of Mr. Phillips, and so "the Preamble" must *not* "give force and meaning to the Constitution"! "Liberty and justice" are very changeable terms, and convey no determinate meaning at all! We must not use the words in their *common* meaning, lest they uproot *Slavery!*

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union, a republican form of government." So said the people. What did they *intend* by it? "The true foundation of republican government," said Mr. Jefferson, "is the equal rights of *every citizen*, in his person and property, and *in their management!*" [And he called all the coloured people "citizens."] Mr. Madison, too, furnished a similar definition, while the question of adopting the Constitution was pending, for the very purpose of telling the people what the Constitution meant by a republican form of government. He denies the name to such Governments as those of Venice, Genoa, Holland, Poland, England, &c. where were witnessed "the Government of a few nobles, and monarchy in its worst forms." He said expressly that the people would *not* adopt the Constitution with *such* definition of republican Government. By adopting the Constitution, with this explanation by Mr. Madison, one of the framers, and the definitions current among their prominent statesmen, such as Mr. Jefferson, one would think they *intended* to establish *such* a republican Government as they described. But, no! If *this* were admitted, the dogma of constitutional Slavery falls to the ground. And so Mr. Phillips discovers that the people intended, by a republican Government, the very *reverse* of the definitions of Madison and Jefferson. They only intended such a Republic as Venice, Genoa, Holland, Poland, and England! They only intended to establish a "Government of a few nobles, and monarchy in its worst form"! A republican Government that would admit of an establishment of religion, and a censorship of the press! The people, in providing for themselves a guaranty of a republican form of Government, in the several States, intended nothing further than this! All this, Mr. Phillips propounds as gravely as though he expected to be believed!

One would hardly have supposed that, in adopting the clause concerning persons held to service and labour, the people intended to place *themselves* in the position of being liable to seizure as slaves, at the mercy of every slaveholder, and without jury trial, or even the order of a Court or magistrate. But this is the exposition of the Supreme Court of the United States, whom Mr. Phillips claims as being on his side in this controversy, and from whom he will not permit us to dissent. For neither the Constitution, the law of 1793, nor the decision of the Supreme Court, nor the argument of Mr. Phillips, make any discrimination in favour of *white* persons, or recognize any distinction of colour. It will be difficult to convince the people that this was their intention, or the intention of their fathers, in adopting this clause. But if it was not their intention, then the main pillar of Mr. Phillips's argument falls to the ground. For the meaning of the Constitution, he says, is the intention of the people.

"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, except by due process of law." What did the people intend by this? According to Mr. Phillips, they meant that they must not be deprived of life, liberty, or property, except by legislative enactment, by Judicial decisions by order of Government or its officials, or as Jackson and other Generals hang spies, and shoot deserters," or as McKenzie shot the suspected mutineers, or as the Supreme Court says the slaveholders may catch whom they please to call fugitives! All this, according to Mr. Phillips, is included in what the people meant by "due process of law." And this is the security they provided for their freedom! This is the meaning of the Constitution, as defined by their *intentions!*

In like manner Mr. Phillips demolishes all the supposed guaranties and safeguards of constitutional liberty, by his expositions. Not one of them are left standing. "The right of the people to be secure, in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against all unreasonable searches and seizures," &c.—"the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus"—the prohibition of State laws passing "bills of attainder," and "impairing the obligation of contracts," and violating freedom of speech and of the press, right of petition, &c. &c.; all these could evidently avail nothing to the people, under such a Constitution as Mr. Phillips leaves to them. The slaveholder's power to claim fugitives, overrides and nullifies them all, and so does the Jackson and McKenzie "due process of law," and the "Government of a few nobles, and monarchy in its worst forms."

And, more marvellous than all this. After having thus reduced the Federal Government to an absolute military despotism, Mr. Phillips gravely informs us that, even allowing "due process of law" to mean what I claim it to mean, (in opposition to his Jackson and McKenzie "due process,") this constitutional provision refers exclusively to the Federal Government, and not at all to the States!

Exclusively to the Federal Government! How then, does it "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?" But, I ask pardon, Mr. Phillips has discovered that "We the people" did not intend *that!* Well, then, what could be the meaning of the restriction—"due process of law"—whether referring to the State Governments or to the National—that leaves the hanging and shooting process in full operation? Were our fathers such dolts as to enact, gravely, a constitutional guaranty of that sort?

Whoever believes it, has *my* leave to reject *my* constitutional views and adopt those of *Mr. Phillips*.

But the climax was not reached yet. One sublimity of absurdity yet remained. After having construed the Federal Government into the most absolute and unlimited despotism the world ever saw, and beyond which nothing in the line of irresponsibility and absoluteness, can be conceived, even to the shooting and hanging of citizens, without Judge or jury, thus annihilating all distinction between *civil* law and *martial* law, and bringing the latter "into the arena of" the former "where it is an absurdity"—Mr. Phillips puts himself to the task of proving that the Federal Government cannot abolish Slavery, because it is only a Government of *delegated and limited powers!* And so, while it has power to shoot and hang us at pleasure, by Jackson's and McKenzie's "due process of law," it has no power at all to shield a single mother's son of us from kidnappers, under the clause chiefly relied upon to prove the constitutionality of Slavery—no power to "secure the blessings of liberty" and "establish justice"—functions wherein the very essence and definition of civil Government consists.

Does Mr. Phillips himself, seriously believe this? If he does, why does he say that successive pro-slavery administrations have "deemed it necessary, out of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, to keep up the FORMS of the Constitution, though they disregarded its SPIRIT?" Why does he say that "the time to discuss the Constitution was while we had one" plainly intimating that recent usurpations had annihilated it?

How could a pro-slavery administration violate the SPIRIT of the Constitution, by the support of Slavery, if its "SPIRIT" were pro-slavery? Has any administration made the Government more servile or despotic than the *Constitution itself* is, according to the expositions of Mr. Phillips?

If (as Edmund Quincy hath it) an Anti-Slavery administration that should fail to (go farther than *any* administration has yet done, and) put down an "organized emigration of slaves" would be "PERJURED LIARS," on account of their violation of their oath to support the Constitution, how is it that "successive administrations" have violated the SPIRIT of the Constitution, by their pro-slavery acts? And how is it, that even the FORM is now violated? If the decision of the Supreme Court, which Mr. Phillips claims on his side of this controversy, (a decision, removing from every citizen protection from chattelhood,) be not the very climax of all the violations of the Constitution by the Federal Government, can he tell us what is?

And how is it, that in his comments upon the Preamble to the Constitution, he admits that the words "*Liberty* and Justice," "*when they are properly used*"—DO "include, everywhere, the idea of emancipation and universal freedom?" Does not this concession cover the whole ground? "*Properly used?*" What right has he to use the word *improperly*? or to suppose that *the people*, in adopting the Constitution used them *improperly?* Can he deny that the legal rules of the construction require him to give the words an innocent meaning, a meaning in accordance with natural equity and liberty, if they are even *capable* of being thus construed? How much more when he confesses he cannot get the contrary meaning out of the words while using them "*properly?*" Is it only by *rejecting* that "proper" use of the language of the Constitution that he can make it pro-slavery? So it appears.

All I ask is, that *the people* will intelligently choose between Mr. Phillip's version of the Constitution and mine. If they mean and think their *fathers intended* by the Constitution what Mr. Phillips makes of it, let them adopt his conclusion and give up all the safeguards of their own freedom for the sake of maintaining the constitutionality of Slavery. If, on the other hand, they reject his interpretation for *themselves*, let them also reject it for the entire population of this country. They cannot make a separation between *colours*, for the Constitution makes none. This part of my original argument, Mr. Phillips has amply confirmed, and upon this issue I submit the question to *the people* for their decision.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

Honeoye, Ontario Co. N. Y. Feb. 26, 1847.

☞ P. S. Will the Liberator please copy this, and my previous article, in the "Standard," of 11th instant? W. G.

CAZENOVIA ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[CONTINUED.]

Evening Session.—Prayer by S. R. Ward.

Resolution 5th, on the Constitution and Union, was read by Dr. Hudson, who then opened the discussion by remarking, that, notwithstanding the American Church once condemned American Slavery as sinful, and all slaveholders as "sinners of the first rank;" and though statesmen trembled in viewing Slavery in our land, when they "remembered God was just;" and though the one threatened Slavery with excommunication, and the others declared "the rights" of all men to be free could never be alienated, annunciating "self-evident truths," pledging their lives, liberties, and sacred honours, in defence of the rights of man, still, under the sanctifying influence of the Church, and the protecting ægis of the United States Government, Slavery had grown with our growth and strengthened with our strength; that slaves had multiplied in our nation from seven hundred thousand to three millions. Did our fathers redeem their pledge? Then what means the fact that we have three millions of slaves sueing for mercy this day in our land! No! when they gained their own freedom they forgot God and their poor brethren in chains on their own plantations, one hour of whose condition (said Jefferson) was fraught with more misery than ages of that they had been rising up in rebellion to oppose. Did they, as an act of gratitude for their own freedom, proclaim liberty to the seven hundred thousand slaves then upon their own plantations? Did Washington emancipate his twelve hundred slaves on his estate at Mount Vernon? Did Jefferson proclaim liberty to his two hundred slaves at Monticello? Did our fathers emancipate their slaves throughout the entire colonies, that this land might be truly a free land, and the people a happy people whose God is the Lord? Or did Washington, truly the father of our country, refuse to emancipate his slaves, indignantly send back the rebuke administered by an English Quaker, and turn slave-catcher? Or did our fathers hold on to their slaves with a death grasp, and in addition, as an earnest of their design to "establish justice," and "promote domestic tranquillity," for the black man, meet in convention, and there enter into a "*compact*" that wholesale "*piracy*" might be carried on under the United State's flag, on the coast of Africa, during twenty long years! Husbands and wives, parents and children, might be stolen—torn from each other and consigned to the most degrading, damnable servitude here in these United States, and this article of compact should be unrepealable till 1808. "Justice"—"domestic tranquillity," with a vengeance!

Dr. Hudson then commented upon the clauses in the Constitution relating to Slavery, and asked what our fathers wanted of those stolen men and women, to bring them from their homes to this country, if they designed to "establish justice" for all men, and to bring Slavery to an end? As a proof that that was not their design, and that they sacrificed every "principle of *justice*," he read their avowed designs from the Madison Papers; also an extract of a letter from Benjamin Franklin, published in the Emancipator, viz: "It (the compromise) is a little sop to Cerberus—the best thing that can be done at present; it cannot last long; there is too much virtue in the country. As fast as men become honest, they will drop Slavery." The history of this country proves the understanding of the Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western States, that the Constitution was a slaveholding bargain. The debates in the State Conventions, to adopt the Constitution—the law of 1793, made in the first Congress—the action of the Federal Government and State Governments, without a single dissenting voice—proves the understanding of all the people in this nation, during sixty years, that it was a slaveholding bargain. And not until quite recently has any one understood the Constitution to be anything else but a slaveholding bargain. When lo! some Daniels suddenly arise and wrest the instrument from those whose sole prerogative it has been, and still is, to interpret it, and claim the right, as individuals, to interpret it to suit *their* convenience, or that of a party, and then call those "no government men" who refuse to act under a Constitution which has ever been declared slaveholding by that department of the Government the instrument provides shall interpret it, and whose interpretation shall be the supreme law of the Government.

S. R. Ward arose in reply, and said if he believed, as friend Hudson did, that the Constitution is slaveholding, he would go with him for Disunion; he would trample it into the dust.

William Lloyd Garrison was the Daniel who first gave him an anti-slavery interpretation of the Constitution, and Liberty party had adopted his interpretation. He disregarded the reported speeches of its framers, as he would the reported discussions of a business committee, or their resolutions prepared for this Convention. What is the true character of the Constitution? What power does it confer on slaveholders? He preferred to examine the Constitution as it reads, and should briefly review the clauses which are said to be slaveholding, and first, the one respecting "*Representatives*" and "*direct taxes.*"

If "three-fifths of all other persons" means slaves in this section, then why do not persons mean slaves throughout the whole instrument? Why have not "direct taxes" been levied on the slaves? Put that clause in operation. Could Slavery endure a direct tax? In his opinion it would do the same execution toward the slave system that the big axe does to the bullock—destroy it. "Direct taxes shall be apportioned," &c. Why has this part of the clause been neglected?

2d. He should not stop to dwell upon the clause touching the Slave-Trade. It was sufficient for him to say, that the year 1808 had long since expired, and we were living past the middle of February, 1847. Whatever might have been its design, it has no practical influence now.

3d. "No person held to service or labour," &c. &c. The true grammatical construction of this clause reads, "No person shall be delivered up," and certainly this cannot favour Slavery. A fugitive in this house is safe. Here Mr. Ward instituted a court for the benefit of the fugitive; proved that was nothing "due" to his claimant, inasmuch as the fugitive had made no contract with his claimant; and decided that he should go free, until, agreeable to the decision of Judge Harrington, he would "show a grant from God Almighty."

Mr. Ward then quoted section tenth, first clause, to wit: "No State shall pass any bill of attainder," to prove Slavery unconstitutional. That that law which makes the condition of the children the same as that of their slave mother, was a bill of attainder in whichever State it exists. The laws of New-York and Pennsylvania, which disfranchises a person because of the colour of his skin, was unconstitutional, being a bill of attainder, thereby attainting or corrupting the blood; and this follows our children even into schools and churches—is countenanced and continued by those who profess to be our friends; for men always premise their abuse of coloured people, by saying, "I'm a friend to you."—As was the case recently, of a Mr. Smith, in Bath, who ordered the school-mistress to turn four coloured children from the school, who, nevertheless got caught in his own trap through the mistake of the teacher, who turned out Smith's children as the darkest-featured ones in the school. No slave can be held in this country, without a violation of the ninth and tenth sections of the Constitution.

The first article of the amendments was violated, in seizing and fining Van Zandt for assisting the poor fugitive, agreeable to the dictates of his conscience. Slaves are deprived of liberty without due process of law. All we need to abolish Slavery is honest men to administer the Government. Mr. Ward said he felt fatigued—had done his part in adducing the views of Garrison, Goodell, and Spooner, that the Constitution is an anti-slavery instrument.

Mr. Remond being called for, remarked that he arose under a feeling of embarrassment, after having listened to the quotations from the learned self-appointed interpreters of the Constitution, Messrs. Goodell and Spooner, and the speech of the equally learned and eloquent gentleman who had just taken his seat; inasmuch as his opportunities for acquiring an education had been very limited, and he hardly knew the difference between Orthodox and burdocks. In the remarks which he should make, he should not dwell on the letter of the Constitution inasmuch as that had been exposed sufficiently, he trusted, to satisfy the audience, by his friend Hudson; but should dwell on the duty of every individual, inferred from the positions sustained by his friend, and from the practical results of the Constitution. If it was true, as Mr. Ward had maintained, that the united and unbroken testimony of the public, respecting the character of the Constitution, from the moment of its formation and adoption, to the present, was of no consequence—that every individual had a right to put his own construction upon it; still a sufficient reason existed in his own mind, for withdrawing from such a Government.

Where has the anti-slavery character, genius, and vitality of the American Constitution been, for sixty years, that Slavery should be so increased in our land? Why has not the Constitution been summoned for the emancipation of every slave, the rescue of every fugitive? He beheld the same helpless, hopeless condition of the slave in New-York, as in Louisiana, so far as constitutional law is concerned.

When I view (he continued) the human flesh-market, established in the District of Columbia, sustained by the Constitution on the one side, and the Bible on the other, and the United States flag floating over it, why should I longer be contending for the Union? What protection did the Constitution afford George Latimer, in the city of Boston, or for the noble Joseph Cinquez and his companions, who had been stolen from their homes, to be reduced to Slavery? J. Q. Adams declared that had it not been for the fact that they were born in Africa, and not in the United States, their condition would have been hopeless! Where was the freedom of our Constitution then?

The great mass of cases affecting Slavery, having been sustained by the Constitution ever since its formation, sufficiently demonstrates its pro-slavery character. No man of colour derives any security from it. What must be its necessary character to afford no protection to the coloured man. The burning of McIntosh in Missouri, the seizure of Latimer in Boston, the disfranchisement of the coloured citizens in New-York, and the poor, panting fugitive, being compelled to flee to Canada, under the shadow of Queen Victoria's throne for liberty, all are the legitimate results of the pro-slavery compact. Dare go to the South as the friend of liberty, and what will the Union be worth to you? Let the murder of a Lovejoy, the branded hand of a Walker, or the martyrdom of a Torrey answer. I yield to no man in loyalty to the Constitution if it recognized my rights. It repudiates my rights, and I repudiate it. What has S. R. Ward in this Union to defend? Where are his rights, so far as the Union is concerned?

God and right, humanity and equity, are nonentities in this Government! What is to be done?—Public opinion is to be revolutionized—to be made to regard freedom more than union with Slavery. Let God and liberty be our motto. Let justice be done, though the heavens fall. In the language of a New England poet,

"Do we remember still
Old Plymouth Rock and Lexington, and famous Bunker Hill?
The debt we owe our fathers' graves? and to the yet unborn,
Whose heritage ourselves must make a thing of pride or scorn?
Grey Plymouth Rock hath yet a tongue, and Concord is not dumb;
And voices from our fathers' graves and from the future come:
They call on us to stand our ground—they charge us still to be
Not only free from chains ourselves, but foremost to make free!"

Convention adjourned.

Third day, 2 o'clock, P. M.—Peter De Clercq, President, called the Convention to order. Opportunity for prayer. C. L. Remond proposed the introduction of a resolution respecting the progress of our enterprise, and the importance on the part of the friends of the slave to subscribe for anti-slavery publications, the National Anti-Slavery Standard, and Liberator, for their own benefit and encouragement, and to be able to diffuse information to their friends, thereby scattering anti-slavery seed, and setting forth our principles, objects, and measures, as the calumniated and despised friends of God's poor, and the duty of all men on this question.

The result of such efforts is not to be calculated; what we sow, we are told that we shall reap in due season; yea, sixty and a hundred fold. The history of our past labours affords us a full verification of this promise. A Birney, a Grimké, a Brisbane, and Hale were all reached and cited to do what they have done for the slave, through such instrumentalities. Liberty party had not such moral influence. It scouts "*moral suasion*," depending upon numbers, the ballot-box, and cartridge-box. Liberty party cannot further any great moral enterprise. I am not among those who sympathize with Liberty party, because of the exceptions that are in the party.

It is said that those who sympathize with us in this place, are few, and weak. Perhaps they are few—that did not discourage him, for he was not in the party that has to count noses for success; but which depends upon the *truth*, the moral influence of the individual; of whom it is truly said, "one shall chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight." We expect to be maligned, to have our names cast out as vile; even such professed Liberty men as Mr. P. who occupies this pulpit, may call me an "*impudent puppy*," it concerns me not. I shall continue steadfast in my course, and the legitimate reward of well-doing will be mine.

Mr. T. Borden remarked "Consistency, thou art a jewel." While the gentleman asks for no favours, no political facilities, yet he is soliciting subscribers to the Standard. How is he to transmit the Standard but through the United States mail? He talks of abuse, yet no man is more *impudent*—charging Liberty party with being pro-slavery, and packing this meeting. The gentleman is unjust, uncharitable. I care not how many friends he has in this town; they know that Liberty party men are true. These gentlemen try to fasten the charge of pro-slavery upon our party, because its members are in the bulwark of Slavery—that this church is pro-slavery, and while yet most of those who sympathize with these men are in our church. The President and Secretary of your Convention are members of this church, and your President is deacon.

Elder Clarke, of this town, is a member of your Society, yet he will not pray for the slave, or read a notice of an anti-slavery meeting.

Elders Lewis and Leonard are of the same character; while so far as the expression of Messrs. Remond and Hudson have gone forth, it has been that this church is pro-slavery.

E. D. Hudson said that he would simply impress upon the audience the contradiction in the speech of Mr. Borden; that the clergy he had enumerated were Abolitionists of our school, and yet would not pray for the slave, nor read a notice for a meeting. He believed the declaration a mere fabrication, and would say they are not of us, nor with us, and the audience were aware of it. Mr. B. tried to pack them on to us, as an offset for his guilty party. The pro-slavery clergy, "the brotherhood," belonged to New Organization and Liberty party; he would not own them. If they were ever in the Society, they were apostates now, and excommunicated.

Mr. Phillips said that the charge of Mr. Borden upon Messrs. Clarke, Lewis, and Leonard was vile slander, if his words were of importance enough to be regarded. Mr. Clarke prayed for the slave, &c.

Mr. Hathaway said then in the course of his remarks on the resolution respecting the Constitution and Union, he should have occasion to make further practical remarks, for the benefit of that pro-slavery church and Liberty party. Mr. H. here read the letter of Rev. J. W. Walker, of Cleveland, Ohio, addressed to the Wesleyans, renouncing his connection as a minister, and member of the Wesleyan church, and of the Liberty party, because of their pro-slavery character; and then remarked, that many of the truth-seeking members of the Liberty party in this State and others, are leaving the party as an unworthy concern, and expected the like action of many of that party in this place.

Mr. H. said he had two reasons for advocating Disunion. 1st. The Constitution is a slaveholding bond in letter and spirit; and 2d. If it is not, then it has been perverted from the first moment this Government came into existence, to the present moment.

He felt called upon to leave the Union, even though the Constitution be anti-slavery, for the same good reason men are called upon to leave the Church; not because the creed of the Church is pro-slavery, but the Church is pro-slavery—is grossly wicked—trampling truth under foot; and all who remain in it, are *particeps criminis*. The same is true of every individual who remains in a slaveholding Government. Every one remaining in it, makes himself responsible for all its blood-guiltiness.

(*To be continued.*)

LETTER FROM SAMUEL MAY.

BROOKLYN, Ct. March 9, 1847.

On Sunday evening last, we had an address here on Slavery, by Rev. B. Shaw, a Wesleyan missionary from Vermont. Mr. Shaw is now engaged in a tour through the eastern part of this State, in the service of, or in behalf of, the Liberty party. He is not, he informs us, sent out by any Society; but is none the less engaged in the work of that party. I am informed he attended a Liberty party county meeting in Hampton, and that the "Charter Oak" has recommended him.

Mr. Shaw is a very rapid speaker, and rather a plensant one. He speaks on all points with the greatest confidence, and quite as one having authority, for he seldom or never stopped to adduce proof of the positions he advanced.

He dwelt first on the scriptural sanctions of Slavery. Next, he said he should show that there was no "legal or constitutional slavery" in this country. Then he portrayed somewhat briefly the evils of Slavery, and pointed out what he regarded as effective remedies.

Under the second head, viz: the non-existence of "legal or constitutional slavery" in this country, as he fell into some very serious errors, and made some grossly incorrect assertions, I have thought it well to send you some account thereof; as, from the wonderful readiness with which the lesson is recited, it has evidently been well committed, and will doubt-

---

* Mr. Phillips attempts to parry my quotations of common law, by citing instances in which these same writers have dodged, or compromised, or explained away the foundation principles they had laid down. And he *might* have quoted the instance in which Blackstone adroitly altered his own Commentaries to prevent Granville Sharpe from using them against Slavery. But the Court, it seems, did not see fit to abandon first principles on that account, and hence the decision of 1772.

† *Less* "frequent," than I could desire! *Most* "clergymen" in this country, abjure my doctrine, and maintain that of Mr. Phillips, as the tone of the New-York Observer indicates.

less be repeated elsewhere in this State. Some corrections of his mistakes, therefore, through your journal, will not be without their use.

His first argument to show that there was no "legal or constitutional Slavery" in the United States, was that Slavery was illegal, at the beginning, and no subsequent action could make it otherwise. Here was a plain confounding of terms and ideas. That Slavery is, and always has been, illegal and unjust, in a *moral* point of view, we concede. But this does not, unfortunately, show that it has not been, or that it is not now, legalized by human tribunals. No fine-spun theory will meet the case. What is the *fact?* Have human laws allowed, protected, fostered Slavery, or have they not? Do *our* Constitution and laws do this? That is the question.

2d. He next said that Slavery was decided to be illegal by the British courts in 1772; and as the United States were then colonies of Great Britain, that decision of course, "included America."

Surely, this manifests an inexcusable ignorance of familiar history on the part of one who undertakes to enlighten and guide his fellow-men. That history, if we can read aright, is briefly this.

By the untiring efforts of Granville Sharpe, Lord Mansfield, Chief Justice of the highest English Court decided in 1772, "that a slave was not liable to any constraint while residing in England." (See Bandinel's History of the Slave-Trade.) The decision went no farther than England. Did not Mr. Shaw know this? Did he not know that it did not set free the slaves in the British West Indies? Has he not heard of an act of Parliament, of 1833, emancipating the eight hundred thousand slaves in the British West India colonies, which act did not go into complete operation until August 1, 1838? If he knew this, how could he say Lord Mansfield's decision "included America?" Cowper's lines would have taught him more correctly than this, one would suppose: "Slaves cannot breathe in England," &c.

3d. The United States Constitution, said Rev. Mr. Shaw, has been called a *compromise* with Slavery, but it is "no such thing" "it does not recognize Slavery." These are Mr. S.'s very words, and he did not undertake to support them by any evidence; we had his bold assertion, nothing more. He spoke, however, of certain papers, which others regarded as valuable documents on this question, viz: "*Mrs.* Madison's papers, as he called them, giving no intimation of their true character, nor mentioning President Madison's name in connection with them. "Did n't we know anything about the Constitution," asked he, "till she published her papers?" Of course, in this letter, I do not attempt to exhibit the evidence of the pro-slavery character of the Constitution; I confine myself to the declarations of men, who will be allowed to know something more of this subject than our lecturing friend. Did Judge Story understand the Constitution? He said it required no State legislation to aid in the surrender of fugitive slaves to their owners; "the Constitution executed its own provisions" on this point. Does John Quincy Adams understand the Constitution? He said, "The freemen of the North gave way, and the deadly venom Slavery was infused into the Constitution of freedom." (Address at N. Bridgewater, 1844.) Does Daniel Webster know aught of the Constitution? He said, "The Constitution found Slavery among us; it recognized it, and gave it solemn guaranties. To the full extent of these guaranties, we are all bound in honour, in justice, and by the Constitution." (Speech at Niblo's Garden, New-York.) I think nothing needs to be added on this point.

4. He said the Constitution gave Congress the power to kill Slavery by stopping the Slave-Trade after 1808. They did prohibit it then, and afterwards declared it piracy; but has it "killed Slavery?"

5. He rung the changes on the Preamble to the Constitution, which declares its object to be to "form a more perfect union," "ensure domestic tranquillity," "establish justice," "secure the blessings of liberty," &c. &c. As if these excellent promises and professions, and *intentions* of some of the framers, if you please, had not been nullified and neutralized by subsequent clauses, rendering it impossible to carry out the meaning and spirit of the Preamble. What does it signify, if a man assures me in the most honeyed phrase that he is my friend and brother, while he robs me of name, of property, and of family, and then stabs me to the heart?

6. He said the words "slave" and "slavery" had been kept out of the Constitution, because *eleven* States out of the thirteen were ready to become free States; South Carolina and Georgia were not "quite ready;" they "wanted more *black labourers*, but *didn't care about their being slaves!*" If they were ready to become free States in 1787, how happens it that *four* of the eleven referred to, remain slave States in the year 1847—sixty years after? One would have thought that any inhabitant of this country must have been better informed than to say the slaveholding States of Maryland, Virginia, and N. Carolina, only wished for black labourers, and were indifferent as to whether they were slaves or freemen!

7. As to the *three-fifths* clause in the Constitution, he glided over it in a manner quite inexplicable to me; and dwelt mainly on the fact that, while at the South they voted for three-fifths of "their niggers," in Connecticut they voted for five-fifths of theirs. This seemed to me to be screening the unrighteous provisions of the United States Constitution behind the prejudices and cruelty of the Northern States towards their coloured population.

8. But, said Mr. Shaw, "if the Constitution were favourable to Slavery, which I deny, I could swear to support it, on the ground that there would be no moral obligation to support those parts which favoured Slavery." Then, why *swear* to the sin? If you swear to support a sin, and do not mean to keep the oath, is not falsehood added to the sin of the oath?

Mr. Shaw intimated that Liberty party was doing the only effectual work against Slavery. He called on his hearers to vote for freedom, and told, in Mr. Pierpont's language of the ballots falling into the box,

> "As snow-flakes fall upon the sod,
> Yet execute a freeman's will
> As lightning does the will of God."

But if the Liberty party Senator from New Hampshire, the last Congress, is a specimen of the legislators that party is to give us, we cannot expect great things in the future. As was well asked, by one of your correspondents recently, "If one Liberty party Senator does so much, how many will it take to abolish Slavery?"

In conclusion, I have only to say, that it was very evident to me from his lecture, that Mr. Shaw was, in some way, a Liberty party agent, traversing this State with reference to the election; and when your readers remember that said election will take place in April, I think they will not be far from the same opinion.

When he announced his lecture to the two congregations here, he said to the people, "if he could n't convince them of the truth of his views, he would try not to abuse them." On hearing his lecture, I thought I understood what he meant by this. For, professed minister as he was, and speaking on the Sabbath evening, (which as he intimated required us, in a peculiar manner, to take a moral and religious view of the subject,) he said not a word to his hearers of any connection with Slavery and slaveholders, in which they might be involved through their church organizations. He eulogized the ballot-box; but had naught to say of the moral power of the churches and ministers of this land respecting this hideous wrong of Slavery, or the manner in which they were using, or rather refusing to use, that power.

Some of these errors were corrected on the spot, so far as the lateness of the hour would admit. But as they have been freely put forth before other audiences in this State, and will perhaps again be, these words of correction may prove of some service. S. M.

Meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society.

At a stated meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, held March 12th, 1847, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, the purchasing the freedom of a slave, is an implied acknowledgment of the master's right of property in human beings, and, in our opinion, inconsistent with the principles set forth in the Declaration of Sentiment of the American Anti-Slavery Society; and whereas, it has been from convictions of duty that we have refrained from participating in such apparently benevolent designs; therefore,

Resolved, That while we appreciate the kind feelings of those who have contributed to the late purchase of Frederick Douglass, we regard the purchase as impolitic and inexpedient, as taking from him one of the strongest claims to the sympathy of the community; as weakening the bond that connects the *suffering slave* with the *freeman*, and as a deviation from anti-slavery principles, which we deem it our duty to condemn.

Resolved That the foregoing resolution be sent for publication in the Liberator, Standard, and Pennsylvania Freeman.

HANNAH LEE STICKNEY, *Pres't.*
SARAH PUGH, *Sec.*

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1847.

Lysander Spooner on the Constitution.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC COUNTENANCE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."—Gouverneur Morris.

Leaving the question whether Law, properly speaking, *can* establish Slavery, Mr. Spooner next attempts to show that it has never *actually* been established by law in this country. For this purpose he examines the written Constitutions of the several States and of the Union.

In making this examination, (he says, p. 15,) I shall not insist upon the principle of the preceding chapter, that there can be no law contrary to natural right; but shall admit, for the sake of the argument, that there may be such laws. I shall only claim that in the interpretation of all statutes and constitutions, the ordinary legal rules of interpretation be observed. The most important of these rules, and the one to which it will be necessary constantly to refer, is the one that all language must be construed "*strictly*" in favour of natural right. The rule is laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in these words, to wit: "Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects."—2 *Cranch* 390.

The following are the clauses in the United States Constitution universally supposed to refer to and recognize Slavery:

Art. I. Sec. 2. Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, which may be included within this Union, according to the irrespective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, *three-fifths of all other persons.*

Art. I. Sec. 8. Congress shall have power * * * to suppress insurrections.

Art. IV. Sec. 2. No person, held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due.

Art IV. Sec. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government; and shall protect each of them against invasion; and, on application of the Legislature, or of the Executive, (when the Legislature cannot be convened,) *against domestic violence.*

The first of these clauses, relating to representation, gives to ten inhabitants of Carolina equal weight in the Government with forty inhabitants of Massachusetts, provided they are rich enough to hold fifty slaves:—and accordingly confers on a slaveholding community additional political power for every slave held among them, thus tempting them to continue to uphold the system.

Its result has been, in the language of John Quincy Adams, "to make the preservation, propagation, and perpetuation of Slavery the vital and animating spirit of the National Government;" and again, to enable "a knot of slaveholders to give the law and prescribe the policy of the country." So that "since 1830 Slavery, slave-breeding, and slave-trading, have formed the whole foundation of the policy of the Federal Government." The second and the last articles relating to insurrection and domestic violence, perfectly innocent in themselves—yet being made with the fact directly in view that Slavery exists among us, do deliberately pledge the whole national force against the unhappy slave if he imitate our fathers and resist oppression, thus making us partners in the guilt of sustaining Slavery. The third is a promise, on the part of the whole North, to return fugitive slaves to their masters; a deed which God's law expressly condemns, and which every noble feeling of our nature repudiates with loathing and contempt.

Mr. Spooner's argument may be briefly stated thus:

1st. The people never intended to recognize or guarantee Slavery in the National Constitution.

2d. If such was their intention, it was never effected; for that instrument, *legally interpreted*, contains no recognition or guaranty of the Institution.

3d. Such recognition, if it exists, is void, and wholly inoperative, since there is no *legal* Slavery in any of the States to which it can refer.

In our review we shall follow the *order* thus briefly sketched, rather than the one adopted by Mr. Spooner, as it will enable us to say all we wish in a smaller space.

And first, the intentions of the people. It is very convenient for Mr. Spooner to make light of the meaning which the people attached to the Constitution in 1789, and since, as of no practical value; though he is ready to allow that the intentions of the *adopters* of the Constitution when legally shown from the Instrument itself, taken as a whole, are binding and conclusive. It is a point we can afford to spare, this of the meaning affixed to the Instrument by the people themselves. We are perfectly willing at any time to waive it and discuss the strict legal effect of the written Instrument without aid from collateral history or national circumstances. But it is idle in an argument of this kind to keep out of sight a view which common sense, the nature of the case, and the maxims of law, demand shall make a part of it. We shall, therefore, devote a brief space to the point.

It will be remembered that Mr. Spooner is now professing to argue a law question, as such, on strictly *legal* principles, referring to legal authorities and rules as tests of the correctness of his opinions. In interpreting the Constitution the Supreme Court have made use of the rules usually adopted. His object is to show, not that the Court ought to lay down any *new rules*, but that they should carry out those already established, and according to these, he thinks that Court is bound to declare Slavery illegal even within the several States.

Bearing this in mind let us see what these rules are, for, of course, the question is not to be decided by looking alone at that *one rule* of the Court, which Mr. Spooner has quoted, and made the corner-stone of his argument. To judge fairly it is necessary to look over the whole ground. Let us then, open the records of the Supreme Court. We shall find that following the example of all other Courts, the dictates of good sense, and of all the authorities, it has uniformly allowed the greatest weight to the contemporaneous interpretation of the Constitution, to the understanding of the nation when it has been universal: according to the oft-repeated maxim of Lord Coke, "*Contemporanea expositio est optima et fortissima in lege.*" (Coemporaneous exposition is of great weight and authority in the law.) The reason of this rule is very evident. Where the words of a statute are plain and clear, and admit but of one meaning, there is, of course, no room for interpretation; they speak for themselves. Where they will equally well admit of two meanings, our object must be to ascertain which of these the makers *intended* they should bear. This is to be discovered by considering the context—the design of the law—the situation of the country at the time, its institutions and circumstances. 1 Black's, 59, 60. If we can discover which of the two constructions was supposed to be the true one at the time, and which has been used and practised upon from the very making of the law, this will go far to show which the makers intended should be affixed to it. Contemporaneous practice is one of the most convincing commentaries on the language of statutes. No doubt as Marshall, quoted by Spooner, says, we are to discover the intentions of the lawmaker from the *words* he uses; but words, when doubtful and ambiguous, are to be interpreted by the context, by the object sought, and by contemporaneous usage. The reader may consult on this point Story Comm. vol. 1, c. v. Blackstone—Rutherforth—Dwarris—C. J. Tindal 5. Scott, 1037. Justice Coleridge 6 A. & E. 7. Cokes Inst. 2. 11.

No work is oftener quoted by the Supreme Court than the "Federalist," as showing the sense in which the Constitution was adopted; in the words of Chief Justice Marshall:

"Great weight has always been attached, and very rightly attached to contemporaneous construction. The opinion of the Federalist has always been considered as of great authority, &c. &c. A contemporaneous exposition certainly of not less authority than that just cited is the Judiciary Act." In Wheaton 1, 304, the Court alludes at length to the "weight of extemporaneous exposition by all parties, the acquiescence of State Courts," &c.

9. Wheaton, 1. Chief Justice Marshall says, speaking of one of the powers of Congress:

"If, as our whole course of legislation on this subject shows, the power of Congress has been universally understood in America to comprehend navigation, it is a very persuasive, if not conclusive argument to prove that the construction is correct."

"Contemporary practice is to be consulted," says Rutherforth, a Scottish writer, always quoted with deference on this subject, "that which prevailed among the people when the law was made and immediately after it,—the one as showing why it was made,—the other how it was understood by those who had the best means of knowing its meaning."

To the same effect he is quoted and approved by Story Comm. 1 p. 385.

In the construction of statutes and local laws it is necessary to refer to the history and situation of the country to ascertain the reason as well as the meaning of their provisions, to enable the Court to apply the different rules for construing them. 1 *Wheaton*, 115.

"In doubtful cases usage may be safely recurred to, to ascertain the meaning of the Legislature."—2 *Overton*, 118.

As the old legal maxim tells us: "*Optimus legum interpres consuetudo.*" (Usage is the best interpreter of laws.)

"The meaning of things spoken and written must be as hath been constantly used."—*Vaugh*, 169.

"Great regard ought, in construing a statute, to be paid to the construction which the sages of the law, who lived about the time or soon after it was made, put upon it, because they were best able to judge of the intention of the makers.—*Coke, cited by Dwarris*, 2. 693.

"In construing a statute the Court will look to the public history of the times—will gather the intention from the language,—if that is ambiguous, from other laws on the same subject, and if necessary refer to the history of the period."—Supreme Court U. S.—3 *Howard*, 24.

Again, we are told by the Federalist, and the doctrine is confirmed by Judge Story, 1 Comm. 453, that:

"Precise legal maxims are inapplicable to a Constitution of Government. In relation to such a subject the natural and obvious sense of its provisions apart from technical rules, is the true criterion of its construction."

The same rule is laid down by C. J. Tilghman in 3, Sergeant & Raule 69. We all know very well that the Constitution is a peculiar instrument—neither wholly a statute nor wholly a contract, but partaking of the nature of both. The rules applicable then to *contracts*, as distinct from laws, have a place here: and the first of those named by Blackstone is "*Verba intentioni debent inservivi.*" (Words must effect the intention of the parties.")

Next in importance comes Paley's rule. "Promises are to be performed in that sense in which the promiser apprehended at the time that the promisee received it." For which see Chitty on Contracts.

Judge Story, Comm. 2. 528, speaking of a protective tariff, points to this rule:

"If the Constitution was ratified under the belief, sedulously propagated on all sides, that such protection was afforded; would it not now be a fraud upon the whole people to give a different construction to its powers."

The reasonableness of this is so self-evident, that it seems unnecessary to enlarge upon it.

We submit, of course, to the rule which Marshall lays down, and which Mr. Spooner makes the corner-stone of his book, that of two meanings one honest and the other wicked, the Court will, if possible, adopt the former. But the point to which we draw attention is, that if the other parts of the law, its object, and its contemporaneous construction afford irresistible evidence that the Legislature intended to make a wicked law, the Courts acknowledge it to be their duty to yield. In other words, cotemporaneous expositions and uninterrupted acquiescence are *one of the* means the Court has always used to arrive at that *irresistible* clearness and certainty on which Mr. Spooner depends so much. Judge Story, Comm. 516, speaking of the disputed power of protection to manufactures, says:

"The terms of the Constitution are sufficient to embrace the power; all nations have used it: the exercise of it was one of the grounds on which the establishments of the Constitution was urged and vindicated. The argument in its favour would seem then *absolutely irresistible* in this aspect.

In 1 Cranch, 299, the Supreme Court, in reply to objections, say:

"Practice and acquiescence for a period of years, commencing with the organization of the Judiciary, afford an *irresistible* answer and fix the construction. The Court will neither shake nor control it."

With such maxims universally acknowledged, it is evident that the understanding of the nation at the time, uniform practice since, and uninterrupted acquiescence by all parties, form one of the most obvious methods of finding the meaning of the Constitution, and one which all courts admit and respect.

Mr. Spooner himself tells us that:

"To suppose that the nation at large did not look upon the Constitution as destined to destroy Slavery, whenever its principles should be carried into full effect, is obviously to suppose an intellectual impossibility; for the instrument was plain, and the people had common sense; and those two facts cannot stand together consistently with the idea that there was any general, or even any considerable misunderstanding of its meaning.—p. 126.

If, then, there could be no general *mis*understanding of the meaning, what was *the* understanding? If we can get that, we shall, according to Mr. Spooner, have the *right* understanding of the instrument.

At the same time he tells us, that:

"The idea is preposterous that the majority of the people of all the States either intended to establish, *or could have been induced to establish*, any other than a free one for the nation. Or that they believed or understood that they were establishing any but a free one.—p. 126.

We confess this last statement made us pause. To argue that Slavery was not tolerated by the Constitution has been aptly compared by Edmund Quincy as "arguing the nose off of one's face," an illustration which the sentiments of Gouverneur Morris, taken for our motto, sanctions and might almost suggest. But it needs a much bolder man to maintain that the American people did not believe that Slavery was alluded to in the so-called pro-slavery clauses! We hardly know of a more daring flight of genius in the whole range of modern fiction than this. Archbishop Whately once framed an argument, in jest, to prove that Napoleon never existed. The attempt of Mr. Spooner here seems a counterpart to that, but then he is in earnest.

Throughout his book Mr. Spooner expends a great deal of very excellent indignation upon those who refer to the Madison Papers and the Convention which met at Philadelphia in 1787, to ascertain the meaning of the people. He tells us very truly that those men were employed merely to draft the Constitution. Their office was that of clerks. Still their opinions are of value. But he mistakes the point. The Conventions referred to are those which met in the several States, and, *in the name of the people, adopted* the Instrument. Theirs were the hands which ratified, and theirs the voices which meanwhile explained the sense in which they ratified and adopted the paper. Their opinions, therefore, are fair and legitimate evidence of the sense in which the Constitution was accepted. Very good evidence exists of the views they took on all the main points, and when they were all agreed, as they were on the Slave clauses, it is idle to say of a *contract*, like the Constitution, that the views of those that made it, are to be thrown entirely out of notice.

But we can throw these debates and the Federalist also aside, and yet furnish Mr. Spooner with abundant, aye, and legal, evidence what was the meaning attached to the chief pro-slavery clause in the Constitution by the people themselves; we mean that relating to the three-fifth slave basis; and whether he thinks it an "*intellectual impossibility*" or not, he will find that the meaning thus affixed to it was the same it has borne ever since, and everywhere, except in his pages.

This clause, the reader will hereafter see, Mr. Spooner maintains has no relation or reference to the slaves.

Now, in 1789, the Constitution was launched. In 1790 the census was taken. In 1792, elections were held throughout the Union, for members of Congress.

If there was no understanding that the slaves were to be counted in a distinct manner, why were they kept carefully separate in that census? Why, in 1792, were the State numbers settled on the basis of reckoning only three-fifths of the slaves? The North he represents as ready to spurn any allusion to Slavery, and the South surely would not willingly be shorn of her strength unless it were so "nominated in the bond." If neither party wished it, how was such an interpretation foisted upon the text? Again, why did *each voter go to the polls* and elect his candidate *on that basis? Every one is presumed to know the law;* and hence, while history tells us that every intelligent man did actually know how the Representatives were apportioned, the law presumes and holds every voter bound to know the same fact also, whether he did or not. In so far, then, as this clause is concerned, we have brought home to Congress, and *to every voter* in 1792—*only four years after the Constitution was adopted,*—full and unequivocal knowledge that they understood it as we ourselves and the nation do now. Let, then, Mr. Spooner explain this intellectual impossibility, "for the Instrument was plain, and the people had common sense, and those two facts cannot stand together consistently with the idea that there was any general or even any considerable *misunderstanding* of its meaning!"

If human ingenuity had been tasked to imagine a practicable method of proving, after the lapse of half a century, how any public document was understood by the *nation at large*, it could not have devised one more complete and perfect than this.

The same may be said of the fugitive slave clause. We know that from 1791, downward, cases were frequently occurring under it, in various parts of the country; yet no one ever denied till now, that the clause was meant to apply to such cases. Even the stout, old Vermont Judge, who asked, in 1807, for a bill of sale from God Almighty before he would consider the proof "sufficient," could not deny the meaning of the bond. Here, again, is one of those "intellectual impossibilities," of which Mr. Spooner's view is fruitful.

The reader will excuse us for detaining him by an attempt to show that the pro-slavery clauses above quoted, were understood as pro-slavery by the people. It is as much waste of time as to heap up proof that the sun shines, or that water will run down hill.

We very readily agree that there was a prevailing opinion—which time has shown to have been a mistaken one—that the abolition of the Slave-Trade would *ultimately* put an end to Slavery. There is no evidence of any general expectation that the Constitution would have any influence *otherwise* in producing such a result. But if such had been the general idea, how far, *in the meantime*, they thought it right to tolerate it, is quite another question. Pennsylvania, in her noble statute, of 1780, proposed and achieved an *ultimate* emancipation, but she guaranteed to the master, meanwhile, the right of property in the slaves he then had. Gradualism was the creed of that day. No one dreamed of meddling with the master's hold over the slaves then living. Even Jay defended compensation. If we place ourselves in their position, there is nothing that need surprise us in the thirteen States, (eleven of which still held slaves,) agreeing to base their representative system on Slavery, to aid each other against a slave insurrection, and return fugitives. They expected, perhaps they wished, still, that Slavery should cease, but thought these measures not wrong in the meantime, and no hindrance to its ceasing. Time has shown they were mistaken. But that mistake does not free their children from the agreements made under it, foolish and wicked, as time has shown them to be, and none the less so because the makers may have thought them harmless and right. Fire will consume, spite of foolish men's thinking that they may handle hot coals and not be burnt. The only way their sons can free themselves is to disown their fathers' act, the Constitution itself. The only path to such release is *over* the Constitution, trampling it under foot; not *under* it, trying to evade its fair meaning.

The reader will observe that we have all along looked at the Constitution in the light of a statute or simple contract, and applied the technical rules usual in such cases. This has been done because we are willing to meet Mr. Spooner on his own ground, and think that even there, his argument has no solid footing. But in strict truth, the Constitution ought not so to be viewed. Its character is peculiar. It is not so much a statute as a great national event, and is to be interpreted not by technical rules, but by liberal reference to the history of the times, the circumstances which produced it, the great parties and interests represented in it, and the national objects it has in view. It was meant for the hands of the statesman, not for the quibbling distinctions of the mere lawyer. As such it has been a ways approached. If here we omit this view, it is not because we do not sincerely entertain it, but solely in order to follow our author, and taking his own principles for granted, to show him that the result is just as much in our favour as it would be on every other possible basis.—W. P.

The Jackson Monument.

The House of Representatives have voted by a very large majority to give to "The Jackson Monument Association" of the city of Washington, "four brass cannon and two brass mortars," taken by Jackson, at Pensacola, in 1814, and now certified by the chief of the Ordnance Office to be "unserviceable."

I should be glad if one of the worshippers of Juggernaut would inform the public by what right he took those pieces, and by what right the United States have kept them? In 1814 Pensacola belonged to Spain. We were never at war with her; on the contrary, in our infancy and adversity, she was our faithful and generous friend and ally. Was Jackson authorized to make war upon her? Of course not. The Government disavowed his acts. He had not even received orders from the Executive, though such orders, had they been given, would have been a flagrant violation of the Constitution. On what pretence did he do it? It was upon an alleged rumour that some British soldiers had been allowed to land in Florida, and were exciting the Indians to hostilities. Whether this was true has never appeared. That it is easy to get up a rumour we know very well, from what took place at the time Jackson wanted a pretext for giving the aid of our army to the cause of the American conspirators in Mexico. A small British squadron had put into the harbour of Pensacola, as by the laws of war it had a perfect right to do; and the Commander had issued from his flag ship a proclamation, promising protection and freedom to those who were in American bondage, as he had also a perfect right to do, and Spain none whatever to interfere. But Jackson had had an angry correspondence with the Spanish Governor, and his vindictive feelings were aroused. For revenge and for Slavery, as may be gathered from any of his biographies, he "took the responsibility" of invading the territory of a peaceable neighbour and early ally of the United States, capturing the chief city and bombarding up its fortifications.

Now had it been true that men, either Britons or Spaniards, had mustered in Florida and marched into the United States, and made war upon us, how would this have differed from that which Jackson permitted and encouraged to be done towards Mexico?

Is it for such exploits that monuments are to be voted by the Representatives of the people in a boasted "Government of laws?" A bitterer satire could not be made upon such a Government, than that the Representatives of the people, having their existence only by virtue of law, should vote to erect a monument to a man out of the spoils of a *robbery*, which he violated the highest law to commit. To make the thing perfect the proposition came from a *repudiating* State. [Illinois.]

The impunity which attended Jackson's two wars upon Spain, and his two deliberate attacks upon Mexico—the irruption of *Gaines'* army in 1836, and the capture of a national armed vessel of Mexico by Capt. *Mervine*, in 1837,—did beyond all doubt embolden his pupil to involve us, without consulting Congress, in the present unjust, unconstitutional, and bloody war for extending and eternizing Slavery in this ridiculous republic.

The Lacedæmonians erected a monument to their heroes, who had fallen in battle, and inscribed thereon,

> Tell it at Sparta,
> That we died in obedience to her laws.

Would not the following be an appropriate inscription for the brazen monument, now proposed at Washington:

> Tell it in the American Republic,
> That I lived in disobedience to her laws
> And was crowned with all her honours.

If an old man, without personal or mental accomplishments, by two Indian fights and an affair of cotton bags, (the idea of which is said to have been suggested by an African negro,) but without a single pitched battle, could make such strides to despotism, what may we not expect from a young hero like Napoleon, or any one of his twenty marshals, with their fifty to a hundred victories each? At the rate we are going on that will come as surely as darkness after the evening twilight. Well, let it come. There will be one consolation. An impartial and contented despot, will be more tolerable than a sectional and insatiable oligarchy.—D. L. C.

☞ We are somewhat surprised at the question which Mr. Goodell puts to us, in his letter, on the first page of this week's paper, but we have no doubt that it is honestly put. In his eagerness in the pursuit of his own argument, Mr. Goodell fails to understand the plainest position of his opponents. But we will answer his question.

What the Tribune meant by the article which Mr. Goodell quotes, of course we do not pretend to know. We are quite sure, however, that the editor of that paper believes that there are certain compromises of the Constitution, in support of Slavery, and which we are bound to maintain. The article, we suppose, was aimed at those who were ready to do *more* than the Constitution bound us to do in the case of George Kirk.

We quoted the article, not only to show the spirit of the New-York press, while the George Kirk case was pending, but also because we believe it to be sound doctrine. We believe the editor and Lord Brougham were right in asserting that there is a law, above all human law, judged by which Slavery is absolutely wrong. For that very reason we are Disunionists. And in the mere statement of the proposition, Mr. Goodell will find the answer he asks for. There is a Divine Law, and a human law. One is of God's making; the other of man's. It is as absurd to say that that is not law which man makes, because it is not in accordance with the Law of God, as it would be to assert that man can do no wrong because the All-Good created him. It is of the Divine Law, as we take it, that the editor of the Tribune and Lord Brougham are talking in the article referred to, and in the light of which they utterly scorn and repudiate the doctrine—the legal quibble—that man can rightfully hold property in man. That Law we believe in, uphold, and mean, by God's help, to obey. But neither of them assert, and probably would not, that, therefore, the Constitution of the United States does not uphold Slavery. That is a totally different question.

We will, in our turn, put a question to Mr. Goodell. If he sincerely believes that Slavery cannot be, in any sense, legal or constitutional, why has he wasted so much time and labour in an effort to prove that certain clauses of the Constitution are not pro-slavery? Of what consequence is it what the framers of that instrument meant, or the people have understood, or legislation has been predicated upon, or judicial decisions have declared? If he can establish his fundamental doctrine, he has done all that is necessary. But does he or Mr. Spooner expect that other men will have any faith in that doctrine, in which they themselves evidently have so little that they write volumes to disprove that which is an absurdity if the doctrine be true?

C. C. Burleigh, in Prison.

We learn from the Pennsylvania Freeman, that C. C. Burleigh has been imprisoned in the West Chester jail, for selling books on Sunday, contrary to the statute. The complaint against him was made by one James McKissick, an Elder of the Presbyterian Church, in Oxford, whose zeal in behalf of the proper observance of the Sabbath was aroused by his being unfortunately worsted in a debate with Mr. Burleigh, at an Anti-Slavery meeting. The delinquent was fined four dollars, and on refusal to pay it, he was sentenced to six days imprisonment. The fine, however, was paid by his friends, and he was released in the course of an hour or two. A great crowd was collected at the Justice's office, to hear the trial, and while waiting for a conveyance to take him to prison, the audacious criminal availed himself of so good an audience, to deliver a most eloquent and effective Anti-Slavery lecture, but without alluding to the circumstances which brought them together. The incident is said to have caused a good deal of excitement in Chester county, and cannot fail to do good to the cause of Anti-Slavery and religious freedom.

The Van Zandt Case.

Our readers will not have forgotten that Wharton Jones, of Kentucky, something more than a year ago, brought an action against John Van Zandt, of Ohio, to recover a penalty of $500 for harbouring and concealing the slave of the plaintiff. A verdict was rendered against Van Zandt, in the Circuit Court of the United States, in Ohio, but on motion for a new trial, the case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States. The following is the decision of the Court, as stated in the National Intelligencer. We understand that the arguments of the counsel for defendant, Gov. Seward of this Slate, and S. P. Chase, Cincinnati, were exceedingly able. We have seen some extracts, however, only, from that of the former:

Wharton Jones, plaintiff, *vs. John Van Zandt.*—On a certificate of division in opinion between the Judges of the Circuit Court of the United States for Ohio, Mr. Justice Woodbury delivered the opinion of this Court, that under the fourth section of the act of 12th February, 1793, respecting fugitives from justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters, on a charge for harbouring and concealing fugitives from labour, that notice in writing by the claimant or his agent, or general notice to the public in a newspaper is not necessary; that clear proof of the knowledge of the defendant that he knew the coloured person was a slave and fugitive from labour, is sufficient to charge him with notice; that a claim of the fugitive from labour need not precede or accompany the notice; that any overt act so marked in its character as to show an intention to elude the vigilance of the master or his agent, and is calculated to attain such an object, is a harbouring of the fugitive within the statute; and that the said act of Congress of 12th February, 1793, is not repugnant either to the Constitution of the United States, or to the Ordinance of Congress, adopted July, 1787, "for the government of the territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio."

The Price of Traitors.

The Washington correspondent of the Tribune gives the following prices current of some of the Northern Traitors who voted against the Wilmot Proviso. Most of them certainly sold themselves "very cheap:"

Senator Breese (Illinois) has had, I believe, two or three sons in the Naval School at Annapolis; one of them was sent out in one of the public ships, at a very early age, within two or three days of the rejection of the "Wilmot Proviso."

Senator Cass (Michigan) had a son appointed a Major of Dragoons under the Ten Regiment bill, while meritorious heroes of Palo Alto and Monterey were not promoted.

Stephen Strong (N. Y.) had the promise of a high office in Oregon, but the Oregon bill failed.

Joseph Russell (N. Y.) it is said, has a son appointed Lieutenant under the Ten Regiment bill. It is said that his son was at West Point, from which in some way he got disconnected. He is now elevated over the heads of his classmates.

Charles Jared Ingersoll (Pa.) was himself nominated Minister to France.

Joseph Edsall (N. J.) has a nephew in office under the Ten Regiment bill.

John S. Chipman (Michigan) was to be made Judge in Oregon, under the bill which failed.

Robert Dale Owen (Indiana) was promised the Mission to Brazil. It is said the President backed out from his promise, on account of Mr. Owen's Physiological work!

William Sawyer (Ohio) has a son, about the size of a large Bologna, at the Naval School at Annapolis, recently appointed.

All the above Senators and Representatives from free States voted for Slavery.

It is also said that almost every other member from the free States voting against the "Wilmot Proviso," had offices promised—many of them under the Oregon bill, which failed. It is supposed the President wished to have the Oregon bill fail—as he had promised more offices than the bill would have contained, to the doughfaces and their relatives. Time will develop the rest. Comment is unnecessary.

Postmaster Morris, of this city, publishes the following notice. The second rule is a most arbitrary and unjust one, but the fourth is so absurd an attempt at tyranny, that we hope everybody will make a point of disobeying it. We hardly think that the Postmaster General will attempt to *Grahamize* the letters of the people of this country:

POST-OFFICE, New-York, March 15, 1847.

The late law of Congress and the order of the Postmaster General, of the 12th instant, establish the following:

Postage is to be charged upon all newspapers from publishers to subscribers. All circulars, transient newspapers and handbills must be prepaid *three cents* for each sheet; if not prepaid they cannot be forwarded by the mails.

Letters, papers, and packages, not exceeding one ounce in weight, to officers, musicians, and privates of the army of the United States, in Mexico, and at any post or place in the United States, bordering on Mexico, will pass free in the mails, provided on the address, after the name of the person, is written "Belonging to the army."

If letters addressed to different persons are placed in the same envelope, unless addressed to foreign countries, a penalty of ten dollars is imposed upon the person making the enclosure.

The Courier and Enquirer of Saturday, gives the first of a series of letters from a "Northern man with Southern citizenship" upon the subject of Slavery. One might guess what the tenor of the letters will be, when told that the writer is a slaveholder; and be certain, when assured that he is also a clergyman. It is a melancholy fact that the staunchest, and the most violent defenders of Slavery are of the clerical profession, and the nearer the laity come to the entire possession of the piety of their spiritual guides, the more impious they are in their notions of practical Christianity. The Courier follows up this letter on Monday with a savage attack on the Hutchinsons, the gist of which is that it is impossible there can be any true music where there is so much mawkish sentiment in regard to Intemperance, Slavery, and War. The critic of the Courier evidently disbelieves the old saying, that "all the good tunes do not belong to the devil." He has no faith in music that does not come from beneath.

Col. Webb's friends should be gratified to learn that his disappointment in not receiving a Major General's Commission for the war, for the extension of Slavery, has in nowise dampened his zeal in behalf of the "Peculiar Institution." He shows the most commendable patience under the ungrateful treatment with which his Southern masters have treated him.

The Voice of the Monarch.

The citizens of Charleston have held a great meeting to welcome Mr. Calhoun home again. Among the officers of the meeting were some of the most distinguished men of South Carolina. Col. J. W. Hayne, from a Committee of twenty-one, made a report, in which the Anti-Slavery demonstrations of the North, and of its representatives in Congress were denounced in no measured terms. Slavery is declared to be the foundation on which not only Southern, but the National prosperity is built. Says the Report:

To preserve this institution, your Committee are well convinced that the slaveholding States must jealously watch their rights under the Constitution—must insist upon that proportionate influence, intended to be secured to them by the compromises of that compact—and, above all, must *at all hazards, and at all times, maintain their* EQUALITY, FULL and COMPLETE *with whatever other communities they hold connection.*

As to our rights under the Constitution, we hold it to be clear and unquestionable, that the slaveholding States are entitled to an equal participation in the Territories of the United States. And we utterly deny the right of Congress to exclude a new State applying for admission to our Union, on account of the existence of any domestic institution *which was tolerated in the original* THIRTEEN.

Your Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, a submission to the proposed exclusion from an equality of benefits in the Territories of the United States, beyond what is already yielded by the Missouri Compromise, would be unwise, dangerous, dishonourable and debasing.

2. Resolved, That this is a question paramount to all considerations of party, as mere temporary policy, and that he who falters, and, Esau like, barters his birthright for a mess of pottage, is recreant to the memory of the past, to his duty in the present, and a traitor to posterity.

3. Resolved. That this meeting cordially respond to the resolutions lately passed by the House of Delegates in the State of Virginia—that they hereby reiterate the same and adopt them, as expressing not only the sense of this meeting and of Charleston District, but as they believe, of the State of South Carolina, and, as they confidently hope, of the WHOLE SOUTH.

Surely the South has no reason to complain of the treatment she has received from this end of the Union. She should give her obedient vassals a word of encouragement now and then. She *may* bind the bonds too tight. They

indefeasible right of each and every citizen of each and every State of the Confederacy, to reside with his property, of whatever description, in any territory which may be acquired by the arms of the United States, or yielded by treaty with any foreign power.

Resolved unanimously, That this General Assembly holds it to be the duty of every man, in every section of this confederacy, if the union is dear to him, to oppose the passage of any law, for whatever purpose, by which territory to be acquired may be subject to such a restriction.

Resolved, unanimously, That the passage of the above mentioned *proviso* makes it the duty of every slaveholding State, and every citizen thereof, as they value their dearest privileges, their sovereignty, their independence, their rights of property, to take firm, united, and concerted action in this emergency.

These resolutions were advocated by Messrs. Calhoun, I. E. Holmes, and others, and unanimously adopted.

We find the following proof of the fanaticism of a South American Republic, in the Courier and Enquirer. We wonder that that paper should permit anything, which it must think so calculated to induce insurrection and bloodshed to appear in its columns:

Buenos Ayres.—The Legislature of the Oriental republic of the Uruguay, have sanctioned the following law:

1. Slavery is forever abolished in this republic.
2. From the time of the promulgation of the present law, all those slaves who have not been previously emancipated *de jure*, in virtue of the Constitution or other laws and decrees anterior or subsequent thereto, enter into the full enjoyment of their liberty.
3. The value of the manumitted slaves to whom the foregoing refers, is a debt contracted by the nation.
4. The owners of those slaves shall receive from the national treasury a just compensation according to law.

Approved on the 28th, and signed, ORIBE.

☞ The Supreme Court of the United States have decided in the famous License Case, that the States have a right to regulate the traffic in ardent spirits. This decision settles the constitutionality of the License Law of New Hampshire—the Twenty-eight Gallon Law of Massachusetts—and the Ten Gallon Law of Rhode Island. Now would it not be absurd for the rumsellers to get up a *License party*, and declare that this decision of the Supreme Court is not binding, because *they* believe that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every man the right of buying and selling as much, or as little, rum as he pleases?

The Kidnapping Law of Pennsylvania.—We are rejoiced to learn that the act against kidnapping, to which we referred a week or two since as having passed the House, has also passed the Senate of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and has received the signature of the Governor. It is now a law We shall publish it as soon as we can find room. It is chiefly a transcript of the law of Massachusetts upon kidnapping and slave-catching.

Mrs. Paulina S. Wright, well known to many of the readers of this paper has been delivering in Baltimore a course of lectures on Anatomy and Physiology. They were received with great satisfaction, and at the close of the course, a committee of the class presented her with three handsomely bound volumes—The Poets and Poetry of Europe and America. Mrs. Wright, we understand, intends giving her lectures in this city.

☞ We call the attention of our readers to the advertisement in another column of a Water Privilege in Duchess county. It is, we are certain, all that it is represented to be.

We regret that an interesting letter from our Boston Correspondent came too late for this week's paper. It will be none the worse, however, for a week's waiting.

☞ We learn with sorrow of the death of Blanche Lowell, the only child of James R. and Maria Lowell. She was a child of much promise and beauty, and greatly endeared to all who knew her. Her age was only fourteen months.

☞ Mr. Benton declines the appointment of Major General, tendered him by the President.

Singular.—A piece of property, valued at several hundred dollars, belonging to Mr. T. S. Holmes, of St. Andrew's Parish, S. C. was capitally punished a few days since, for an attempt to commit a rape. Mr. Holmes should have been punished for not taking better care of his property.

We are indebted to some friend for a copy of a Trenton paper containing an excellent speech of B. Rush Plumley, on the Distress in Ireland.

From our New Bedford Correspondent.

Action of the Massachusetts Legislature on Slavery.—Debate thereon.—Hon. Mr. Lunt, Editor of the Boston Atlas, &c.—Public Sentiment in Massachusetts.—Meeting of the Bristol County Anti-Slavery Society.—S. S. Foster.—Denunciation.—Recommendations to the editor, and to the readers.—The New Bedford Lyceum.—Prejudice against Colour.—Need of Conversion at the North—Bible Argument of the Rev. President Shannon.

New Bedford, March 10, 1847.

Dear Gay:—Have you seen in the Whig the report of the discussion on the tremendous Anti-Slavery Resolves of the Massachusetts Legislature? Verily, the assembled wisdom of Massachusetts will reform the world—in time. Do you know what their committee on Slavery have done? After sleeping soundly the whole of the session, (out of modesty no doubt, to let other States which have not been so *forward* in the movement have their turn,) they have made one of the greatest discoveries of the age. They have resolved, "That the existence of Slavery within the limits of these United States is a very great calamity." No—I beg their pardon for misrepresenting them—they reconsidered that, I presume as too "fanatical and denunciatory," and *struck out the "very."* I need not urge you to publish their discovery in the Standard, or point out to you the very important—I mean the important without the very—consequences which flow from it. I recommend that our agents, instead of doing the comparatively trifling work they are engaged upon now, be exclusively engaged in printing and spreading abroad this new light shed upon the subject by Massachusetts legislators.

The debate upon the subject, whether we consider the novel character of the truths enunciated, the overwhelming amount of wisdom, genius, high moral courage, and lofty regard for the great principles of liberty and humanity, may justly be considered as the great debate of the age. The people of Massachusetts ought to raise golden statues to their legislators, with an inscription that in the year of the Christian religion, 1847, the great truth was by them promulgated, that the existence of Slavery comes pretty near to being a "very" great calamity.—Happy the people whose rulers *lead* them in the discovery of great ideas!

Let me give you some few extracts from this thrilling debate. Mr. Branning, of Tyringham, and Mr. Putnam, of Roxbury, "hoped that the resolutions would not be hastily driven through the House; wished for time for consideration." Deliberation is always the characteristic of profound wisdom. A truth so new and startling as this, that Slavery is "a very great calamity," leaving out the "very," should be profoundly considered. We hope that all those gentlemen may not only have a few days to consider it, but may for the future be put high up upon the shelf, that they may have full leisure to consider it for the rest of their lives. Mr. Lunt, of Newburyport, the *gentleman* famed for his courteous demeanour when Chairman of another Committee on Slavery, considered it to be of very little importance whether these resolutions were passed now or a week hence. "We fully agree with him and would add, "or ever." Mr. Lord, of Salem, was not prepared to say that Massachusetts should call Slavery an evil." Mr. Lord is an unripe Solomon who will doubtless, at some future day, get his mind settled on that point. Mr. Hayden, of Boston, editor of the "Southern Correspondent" newspaper, *moved to amend the first resolve by striking out the word "very,"* in the third line—which was passed. If we had been a member of the assembled wisdom we should have moved, in order more fully to carry out the purposes of their resolutions, to amend the amendment by striking out *all* after the word "a," so that they should read as amended, "Resolved, that the Legislature of Massachusetts views the existence of human Slavery within the limits of these United States as a"——We think the resolutions would then produce very much more of the *same kind* of effect they will now produce in Washington. Mr. Lord, of Salem, moved an amendment. "He wished to express an opinion upon Slavery generally, and not to point to the slave States in particular." Why did not the gentleman say, "Slavery in the abstract?" He has not learned his catechism.. Mr. Lunt, of Newburyport, had examined the resolutions, (this was the next day,) and was perfectly willing to vote for them. They would do no harm, and *perhaps* would not do *much* good, (we agree with the gentleman with slight amendments.) Democratic Mr. Whitaker gave notice that the resolutions were sufficiently innocent for Democrats to vote for. Mr. W. is quite right. They would not hurt a flea. At length the resolutions were unanimously passed, one or two men who have got into such company, by mistake, asking to be excused from voting on them on account of their contemptible milk-and-waterishness.

Seriously, has old Massachusetts ever been so disgraced before? I know not when, unless it was when she re-chose George N. Briggs her Governor, and paved the way for this the paltriest exhibition of herself she ever yet made. If I were not moved to come out from supporting such a Government from deep indignation at its wickedness, I should want to do so from very shame at its cowardice. Alas for us, if the people are no better than their rulers! But I believe they are. Once get beyond the influences of cotton Whigs, of Baltimore Convention Democrats, and dishonest Liberty party wire-pullers, and under the thickest crust of selfishness and prejudice, there's a sound part in the heart of the *people* that will re-pond to the call of justice and humanity. I think that notwithstanding all discouraging signs, the moral standard of the people of the North is slowly but steadily rising. Indeed, I do not know that these signs are discouraging. It is well when politicians show themselves in their true colours. Satan never throws off his mask until he has grown desperate. I like this action of the Massachusetts Legislature far better than the lying action of some past years, when they spoke great words, meaning nothing and deceived the people by them. Now they have spoken little words which can deceive nobody. 'Tis better so.

I do not believe that the heart of the North is yet *organically* diseased. It is sick with selfishness and the love of gain, sick with the idolatry of the wicked work of its own hands—a pro-slavery Constitution—sick above all with a hypocritical and unchristian Church; a Church that makes long prayers and calls men-stealers regenerate Christians—but it may be cured, and I believe it will be.

I have just returned from the quarterly meeting of the Bristol County Society, at Fall River, and there I saw Stephen S. Foster in their great town hall, on a Sunday evening, scattering the living coals of truth upon the heads of the people—truths which not many years ago would have caused a furious mob in that very Democratic town. But the great assembly bore it all with the utmost patience, and I believe really went away to think whether after all such words are mere rant and "fanaticism" and "denunciation." To be sure they are a very pious people there—so much so, that I do not believe that more than one of their churches could be obtained to speak for the slave in—and that may partly account for their stillness on *Sunday* evening—still it indicates a change that our friend Foster's aggravating way of stating the naked truth in all its hideous deformity, can be listened to patiently on any evening, and that he can collect an audience of twelve hundred people to hear him, especially on a Sunday evening. The ministers could not have known that their people were out.

A word about this matter of denunciation. It occurs to me—perhaps because I have just been to an Anti-Slavery meeting—that you do not put *truisms* enough into your paper—things, I mean, which are truisms to Abolitionists but not so to the unconverted. This matter of denunciation is one of them. The truth of the matter seems to be simply this: that Slavery and its influence on North and South is a subject of which not a forty-Foster-power of denunciation could say things too bad, or bad enough. I recommend to the readers of the Standard who do not think so, to examine the point by a course of Anti-Slavery reading,—a thing, which I undertake to say, not one of those so forward to talk of "denunciation" has ever done. I recommend them to read the "Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses." Slavery's own testimony against itself. Why does not some one continue it down to the present time? "The Church as it is," and the "Brotherhood of Thieves," spite of its denunciatory title. These are the Church's testimony against itself. Wendell Phillips's pamphlet, "Can Abolitionists vote?" The Narrative of Frederick Douglass, to the truth of which slaveholders therein named have very foolishly given their own testimony. Abolitionists will give them a bushel of such books for the cost of the printing. If they will read only those I have named I will engage that, *if they are honest*, (an important "if" here) ninety-nine in one hundred shall say that there *can* be no "fanaticism" on the subject of Slavery.

In my last epistle on Mr. Sumner and his lecture, I promised to give you an account of the New Bedford Lecture Association, and its whole course of lectures, which promise I will here fulfil.

The circumstances which gave occasion to the formation of the association have been detailed in the Standard, but I will briefly recapitulate them. Last year, the New Bedford Lyceum, for what reason does not very distinctly appear, refused to the coloured people admission to their lectures. They had attended them for a number of years previous, and no complaint had been made, but now an ancient regulation, which had lain for years a dead letter, was revived, prohibiting the sale of tickets to any but members, and then, upon one of the most respectable and intelligent of the coloured people being proposed as a member, he was rejected. The Lyceum afterwards, in the plenitude of its liberality, voted the coloured people the use of the *north gallery*—a privilege which they, of course, had too much self-respect to avail themselves of.

All this was not done without the strenuous opposition of the friends of the coloured race, and the opponents of this unchristian prejudice, and when they found their efforts unavailing, they came out from the Lyceum, preferring to sacrifice the privilege of attendance they had purchased, rather than in any way appear to sanction such unrighteous proceedings.

These proceedings met also with a severe rebuke in the refusal of R. W. Emerson, Charles Sumner, Horace Mann, and Dr. S. G. Howe, to fulfil engagements to lecture, made previous to then.

This year, upon the previous action of the Lyceum being *confirmed* by a new vote, a number of gentlemen who had opposed it, met together, and determined to establish an institution which should be open to all the complexions which God has made. They accordingly formed themselves into the "New Bedford Lecture Association," and chose a board of managers consisting of Andrew Robeson, President; Jos. Ricketson, Secretary; John F. Emerson, Dr. Julius Mayhew, and James B. Congdon. They made arrangements for a course of lectures which I think it will not be uninteresting to your readers if I enumerate. Besides one or two of home production, we have had Ralph Waldo Emerson twice, once on Home and its Influences, and his famous lecture on Napoleon; Theodore Parker twice, on the Signs of the Times, and on the Progress of Humanity; Wm. H. Channing, on the relations of the Church, the College, and the State; Rev. James F. Clarke, on the Sphere of Woman, as illustrated by the History of Joan of Arc; Rev. Caleb Stetson, on Labour; Rev. John Weiss, on the Life of Toussaint; Hon. Horace Mann, on Education; Hon. Charles F. Adams, on Milton; Edmund Quincy, on the Present Aspect of Civilization; Wendell Phillips, on Commerce in its relations to Liberty; Wm. L. Garrison, on Freedom of Speech, and Freedom of the Press; John W. Browne, on the Sailor; Charles Sumner, twice, on the Employment of Time, and on Algerine Slavery.

To put these lectures within the reach of all, black as well as white, the tickets were put at fifty cents. Some of the members generously volunteering to make up the deficit if it should be necessary. Notwithstanding that the undertaking was begun after all the Lyceum tickets were sold, upwards of eight hundred of ours were disposed of, and we have very nearly cleared our expenses, with every prospect of a surplus another year.

It is but justice to the New Bedford community generally, to state, that the proscriptive proceedings in the Lyceum were the work of a small majority of a small body, and that even if it had depended on the votes of the Lyceum *audience*, instead of merely the members, no such laws would have been passed. The excuse may pass for what it is worth, but the connivers at wrong are as guilty as the wrong-doer. The inertia of indifference always weighs in the scale of sin. It would take but a general and decided expression of disapprobation to abolish the disgrace, but that there is not interest enough in an oppressed people, or love enough of humanity, to produce. I cannot help thinking, however, that another year will see its end.

A large portion of the Lyceum audience have attended our lectures, drawn thither by the fame of most of the speakers. They have thus shown that their prejudices are not strong enough to prevent their mixing in an assembly with their coloured brethren. Indeed, they have not the shadow of an excuse for such a prejudice. New Bedford has a large coloured population, a great proportion of whom are fugitives from the "Barbary States of the South," and in moral worth, orderly conduct, and true respectability, they compare very favourably with any other class of the community from the highest to the lowest. I speak from some personal knowledge, and from the testimony of others who have much more. An active member of our Benevolent Society told me that though they had an unusual number of applications for relief this winter, they had scarcely one from a coloured person. They help one another—these people who "cannot take care of themselves."

Spite of her proscriptive Lyceum, New Bedford is honourably distinguished in this, that no distinction of colour is recognized in her public schools, and it is a fact worth recording, that in her High School, an institution of the highest character, and where the study of mathematics is carried considerably beyond the requisites for admission to Cambridge, one of the first scholars last year, in the boy's department, was the son of an Irish labourer, and one of the first scholars in the other, was a coloured girl.

There is to me, no more striking proof how little we, as a nation, understand or appreciate the spirit of Christianity, than this prejudice against colour. The doctrine of the brotherhood of man is in our creed and on our lips, but it is not truly a part of our belief. Our *belief* is that the black man is not our brother, equal with us in the sight of God, but an inferior being, something between man and the monkey, something which cannot, by any possibility attain to the moral and intellectual elevation of the white. We trample upon him, debar him from his rights, deprive him of education, condemn him to the lowest and most degrading occupations, and then turn round and taunt him with his "inferiority." We are slaveholders at heart at the North, as much as at the South. We do not make slaves by law, simply because the climate renders slave labour unprofitable, but we have as truly a slaveholding spirit as any Southern planter. Indeed I question whether the Southern planter, living, as he does, in the midst of the coloured people, and in intimate connection with them, is not truly freer from abstract prejudice than his Northern defender and abettor, and if the South, by some miracle, should repent, and, to-morrow, free all their bondmen, I doubt whether they would not sooner come to treating them as equal brethren than we shall.

This is the reason why we give to the South such steady and unvarying support. Boston, and Lowell, and Lawrence, and Manchester, make vast sums of money out of the system, it is true, and that is one cause—but the great reason is that we are ourselves slaveholders in spirit as much and more than the South Carolinians themselves. We need to come to a new knowledge of Christianity before we can be converted. A saint who should wander hither from some other planet, might well question whether Christ had ever been on earth. Our religion is but a mixture of dark and unintelligible dogmas with the rude and bloody superstitions of the Jews. The glory and beauty of the Jewish faith we have as little conception of as of Christianity itself. Our God is a God of war and wrath, a God of partialities and prejudices, of human passions, the huge projection of human wickedness and weakness. If any one call this language extravagant, let him only read the little pamphlet, "The Church as it is," compiled from the very words of Doctors of Divinity, members of churches, and "religious" newspapers, a book, the like of which, for the impiety and wickedness of which it is made up, cannot easily be found.

The Rev. President Shannon thus concludes a "Bible argument" in favour of Slavery: "Thus did Jehovah stereotype his approbation of domestic slavery, by incorporating it with the institutions of the Jewish religion, *the only religion on earth that had the Divine sanction*;" and this, I verily believe, still expresses the faith of thousands at the North. Is any language too bad for such a religion as this? What must be the corruption of a state of society when such hideous doctrines can find advocates, when the Church is either the teacher of such impiety or holds fellowship with that which dôes?

I have wandered from my immediate subject into some of the "truisms" I spoke of, or rather I have gone deeper into it. It is the false and corrupt *religion* of the country which is the great nourisher of prejudice against colour, as well as all the other wrongs of the slave system.

A.

Letter from Philadelphia.

Miss Douglass's School-room.—Meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society.—Purchase of Frederick Douglass—Moral Reform Retreat for Coloured Females.

An interesting meeting of this society was held last week at Sarah M. Douglass's school-room, which by the way is ornamented with maps, and abundantly furnished with useful apparatus showing that attention is paid to all the branches necessary to a good education.—This school is in all respects well managed, and it is a matter of astonishment that it is not better patronized by those for whose particular benefit it is designed.—But it is of the meeting I most intend to speak. A resolution condemning the purchase of Frederick Douglass, which it appears had been laid over from a previous meeting, was brought up for discussion. It will be unnecessary for me to give you the resolution as by a vote of the Society it was to be offered to you and also to the Freeman and Liberator for publication. The debate was quite animated—sentiments were expressed showing that this Society has adopted a high standard of moral action which, if faithfully adhered to, will result greatly to the advancement of the Anti-Slavery cause in this State. Probably in no part of our country are such frequent appeals made for the purchase of slaves as in Philadelphia; cases are constantly recurring, and unless Abolitionists take a decided stand on this subject, they will be tempted to yield to their sympathies, and thus furnish as good a market for slaves as any slaveholder could desire. This doctrine of compensation was clearly shown to be inconsistent with the Declaration of Sentiments of the American Anti-Slavery Society, published twelve years since, and it was forcibly argued that whatever might be the private opinion of the person who penned that document as regards individual cases, the public were bound to take th at Declaration as it stands, and it was both their right and their duty to declare when, in their opinion, it was infringed upon. It was also shown that this Society, by the passage of a resolution some four years ago, not only declared that such purchases were inconsistent with Anti-Slavery principles, but that they would discountenance all such procedures, and that in accordance with that resolution it was the duty of this Society to avail themselves of so distinguished an opportunity to maintain their expressed principles. The views of Frederick Douglass himself were brought forward, and urged with great effect. It was stated, that at a meeting of the Eastern Penn. State Society a few years ago, he said that "he would never assist in any way in purchasing slaves, not even his own mother or sister." His recent remark in his letter to H. C. Wright "that he would have seen Auld *kicking* before he would have paid him the money," was a sufficient condemnation of the act. The idea which has been advanced that it was *necessary* to appeal to English philanthropy to effect this purchase was proved to be false and declared *insulting* to American Abolitionists; for had they not been withheld by principles of duty, and had it been thought desirable this sum, or *any amount* necessary, would have been raised with the greatest ease. The absurdity of offering to the slaveholder the redemption money with one hand and a protest against its acceptance with the other—together with the utter uselessness of such a course, was fully exposed. So long as he could and would purchase with the avails of *one* able bodied man, seven or eight *little children*, whom he would train up and keep forever in the dark prison-house of bondage, the slaveholder, even should he listen to these protests, would laugh in his sleeve and desire no better encouragement in his nefarious traffic. Not caring whether Abolitionists or slaveholders were the instruments by which he increased his gains he would permit and even encourage his more *intelligent* and *troublesome* slaves to obtain their freedom in this manner, that he might add to his stock those of a less dangerous character and feel greater security in their possession. I was pleased to see that when the vote was taken there appeared to be not more than two dissenting voices, and one of them was from a member who attended as she said, "for the purpose of withdrawing from the Society, having joined the Liberty party." Some interesting circumstances respecting the Moral Reform Retreat for coloured females in Lombard street above 7th, where stated to the meeting. It seems that it has been difficult to obtain sufficient work this winter to keep this useful institution in a prosperous condition. While the house has been full of inmates the rent has been raised, and they have been obliged to restrict themselves to two meals a day and to go without comfortable clothing in order, if possible, to meet their expenses. It is to be hoped that this establishment will not be left to suffer for want of means. There are several good sewers among the inmates, and any plain sewing would be thankfully received, also carpet rags, bagging, &c. The Society gave them a donation towards their rent, and appointed a committee to endeavour to procure from the charitable something more. The Society also appointed their Fair Committee, and a meeting is soon to be held for organization. This looks like beginning in season, and I hope it is an omen of the vigor and energy with which they intend to make preparations for the next Christmas.

A.

To Correspondents.

E. D. H. Yes, he may rely upon it.

M. K. We think the matter is in its proper shape now before the public, and nothing more need be said, unless something new should be offered on the other side.

W. P. A. Certainly, if he is n't out of patience with the delays, which, however, we assure him, are unavoidable.

A. K. F. It had been stopped by order of the Postmaster, because not taken from the office.

D. R. We hope to be able to send him one this week, and no doubt shall receive more *goods* of the same sort soon. His other request shall also be attended to.

P. A. C. Will receive a letter from us by mail.

S. M. of C. Her request to stop the paper is a very reasonable one, if she do n't like it; but we are not so certain that the other,—to return the money—is. Would she ask her grocer to take back a box of tea, or a barrel of sugar, and refund the price after she had used the half of it, on the plea that she did not like tea or sugar? She should have found out that she did not like the "abstraction" of anti-slavery before she bought a certain quantity of that commodity. We will, however, refund the money, if she will prove to us that she has not got what she paid for.

This Week's Paper.

Fourth Page.—*Poetry:* High Thoughts; The Verdict of the Poor; Psyche. *Miscellany:* Toussaint (continued); Alexander Dumas; Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

First Page.—*Communications:* Letter from William Goodell; Cazenovia Anti-Slavery Convention, (continued); Letter from Samuel May.

Second Page.—Meeting of the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society.

Died,

In Jackson, Washington county, (N. Y.) February 24th, Walter Maxwell, Esq. aged 86 years.

In New Haven, (Ct.) 1st instant, Joseph N. Clarke, Esq. President of the Mutual Security Insurance Company, of that city, aged 69 years.

On the 2d instant, in Mount Holly, (N. J.) Josiah Zelly, in the 40th year of his age.

In Nantucket, Barker, son of Mr. Barker Burnell, aged 17 months.

In Fencote, Yorkshire, (Eng.) of consumption, Mr. John Langton, of Nantucket, aged 74 years.

In Leicester, Mass. March 7th, Charlotte Emerson Flint, aged 26, eldest daughter of Dr. Edward Flint.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

The Hutchinsons gave their farewell Concert in this city, to a crowded house, on Friday evening last.

A petition was presented to the Pennsylvania Legislature, a few days since, signed by ten thousand women of Philadelphia, asking for the abolition of capital punishment.

Vermont has decided, by a majority of about six thousand five hundred, that no license shall be granted for the sale of intoxicating drinks, except for medicinal and mechanical purposes.

The Irish Relief Committee of New Jersey have a ship loading at Newark, for Ireland.

The following sums were remitted by the Irish to their suffering countrymen in the months of January and February:

Remitted from New-York, in drafts and for passengers back in January and February,	$326,410
Remitted from Boston,	200,000
do. Philadelphia,	88,658
do. Baltimore,	8,125
Total,	$623,293

The Tribune says, a servant girl in a family at Brooklyn, lately sent all her earnings, $30, to her family, in Ireland, and a few days afterwards received intelligence that her father, mother, brothers and sisters, eight in number, had died of starvation.

Gen. James Irwin, of Centre county, Pa. has been nominated as the Whig candidate for Governor.

Mr. Hamlin, Representative from Penobscot District, Maine, on his return home, had his trunk stolen in Philadelphia, wherein was contained his Congressional *hire*, amounting to eight hundred dollars in gold. The Railroad Company paid Mr. H. the value of his trunk, but did notindemnify him for the loss of his wages.

Peace Movements in Mexico.—The "*Courier des Etats Unis*" says it has received, by way of Havana, private advices relative to the affairs of Mexico, which contain several important revelations with regard to the *reaction* now going on secretly in the capital. It seems (says the Courier), that the clergy, whose property has been menaced by the war party, is disposed to make its own cause that of the Republic, and permit the projects of *peace* to triumph. Its plan is to replace the Federal Congress, from whose action it has nothing to hope for, by an absolute power strong enough to force Mexico to agree to a peace. Such (continues the Courier) is the double road leading to this end, and it is Santa Anna upon whom they are also reported to have cast their eyes. That General would then be sure of arriving once more at the dictatorship, supported by the clergy, and on the express condition of respecting its property, and promptly concluding a treaty of peace. There is nothing in this combination, (the Courier adds) which is at all improbable, due regard being had to the actual condition of Mexico; and beside, the person who communicates this intelligence is in a position which gives to it weight.

The Relief Committe of Louisville, Ky. have forwarded to Newbold & Craft, of this city, four thousand dollars, to be invested in provisions for the Irish poor.

Rather Particular.—Somebody advertises in Brooklyn for boarders, stipulates that gentlemen must not put their feet on the mantle in the winter, nor out of the window in summer, nor use spittoons at meal time. If single, he must not play the trombone in his room, make love to the servants, nor comb his whiskers at the table. The ladies must not turn up their noses at everything on the table, unless they have a natural pug, and none of the party must drink or talk with a mouth full of vitals, nor must they fight for the top buckwheat cake.—*Mirror.*

The Boston Post asks. Why should the Jamaica Pond water be especially loved by children? Because it is a little *doggy*.—

Cape Cottage, near Portland, Me. has recently been destroyed by fire.

A bill has been introduced into the Senate of Louisiana, to abolish the punishment of Death in that State.

A correspondent of the Tribune says of the appointments made by the President since the adjournment of Congress that out of 184 Captains, 1st Lieutenants, and 2d Lieutenants, 41 Captains are from the slave States to 15 from the free—23 1st Lieutenants from slave States to 8 from the free—57 2d Lieutenants from the slave States to 32 from the free.

There is a coloured convict at Sing Sing who has sculptured some figures in marble, which are said to possess great merit as works of art.

Will the N. Y. Tribune correct its mistake about the sum contributed in Woonsocket, for the Irish? It was $3,400 instead of $750—as reported in The Tribune of March 4.—*Woonsocket Advocat.*

Within the last twelve months the citizens of New York have taken stock in various new railroads to the amount of near $7,000,000.

Homicide.—Mr. James Danelly, of Macon, lost his life on Sunday evening last, while in the act of inflicting some blows upon a free woman of color. In appears that when Danelly entered the house, she was sitting cleaning her nails with a small penknife. In the course of the scuffle which ensued, she either intentionally or accidently inflicted a blow which caused his death in a few minutes. The girl was immediately arrested and will be tried for the offence, though the impression seems to be that the killing was entirely accidental.—*Savannah Republican.*

Thirty Thousand Three Hundred and Thirty Dollars Reward.—The Adjutant General of the United States Army offers in the National Police Gazette, a reward of *thirty thousand three hundred and thirty dollars* for the arrest of *one thousand and eleven deserters from the U. S. Army!* The names and particular descriptions of each soldier are contained in the advertisement.

Among the inmates of the Almshouse in this city is a learned German, Dr. Heidelderg, who was once a preacher, then a professor in the Berlin and Halle Universities, an author, a doctor of philosophy, and now a pauper.

The number of slaves in Delaware in the year 1840, when the last census was taken, was 2,605.

Genl. Tom. Thumb who is now on exhibition at the Museum, is said to have made £150,000 by his European tour. It is estimated that this is about 178 times his own weight in gold!

Charles Kemble, in one of his recent readings of Shakspeare, said to his audience—"No actor has ever been sentenced to death or suspended on the gallows."

Fast Day.—The Governor of Massachusetts has appointed Thursday, the 8th day of April next, to be observed as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer.

Killing a Slave.—Mr. Thaddeus Brown, brought before the Mayor on Wednesday last on the charge of unlawfully killing John Taylor, a slave, owned by Brockenbrough Peyton, of Caroline co., has been discharged on the ground that he killed the negro to save his own life, having been forced into a corner from which there was no escape. All the witnesses testified to Mr. Brown's good character, and his usual kindness and forbearance toward the servants in the factory under his charge.—*Richmond Enquirer.*

Seven Thousand Bushels of Corn for Ireland.—Capt. James and Chas. Wright purchased yesterday 7,000 bushels of corn, in the name of the Committee, to be forwarded to Ireland upon the opening of the river.—*Albany Evening Journal, 11th.*

Food for Ireland.—The ship George Thatcher which cleared this day for Cork and a market, had among her cargo, 36,669 bushels of Corn, and 501 barrels of Indian Meal.—*Boston Transcript, Friday.*

The Shakers of Watervliet, Ohio, believe they have received a new revelation, and are sending out delegates, who hold public meetings in large towns at the West. They say there is now a crisis in the world's affairs and they are constrained to sound the alarm. Seven men and six women were at Dayton lately.

The Boston Courier, speaking of the resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature, on the question of Slavery, says:

"We believe that a majority of the people of Massachusetts were ready for, and expected of their Legislature, some expression of sentiment and feeling, spiced with a little more vitality than "the resolutions." Massachusetts has so frequently resolved, and protested, and remonstrated,—with all-becoming politeness and courtesy towards the chivalrous and generous South,—that her resolutions, and protestations, and remonstrances, are little better than proverbs and laughter-provoking by-words, in those favoured regions where,—and no where else, according to recent announcations,—the principles of civil liberty are understood, and fixed upon their only true and permanent basis—DOMESTIC SLAVERY! We hope it will not be always thus; but the future looks dark and murky.

This we know,
Yet, knowing, disbelieve, and try again
What we have tried, and struggle with conviction—
Each new experience gives the former credit,
And reverend gray THREE-SCORE is but a voucher
That THIRTY told us true."

The Prince de Joinville, with a French squadron, consisting of at least eight line of battle ships, four or five frigates, and as many steamers, will visit New-York—it is stated in the correspondence of the *Courier des Etats Unis*—some time in the course of the ensuing summer.

John Tyler, jr. has been appointed a captain of one of the new regiments.

Kidnappers.—One George C. Buckley has been arrested for kidnapping in this city. He took a coloured boy from the city and carried him over into Kentucky to sell him. The boy was brought back, however. *White* authority will be brought sufficient to convict him, and care will be taken that he does not escape by a quibble, as he did once before.—*Morning Herald.*

New Hampshire Election.—The following is the estimate of the Boston Post of the result of the election in New Hampshire:

	1847. W'ms.	Colby.	Berry.	1846. W'ms.	Colby.	Berry.
185 towns..	27,846	20,121	8,053	24,316	16,778	9,923
21 " ..	2,068	800	364	1,900	708	409
206 "	29,914	20,721	8,417	26,216	17,846	10,332
	29,338		20,921			17,486
Maj. for W.	576		29,338			27,818

Maj. against Williams, 1,602. Net Democratic gain, 2,178.

Eighteen towns and voting places remain to be heard from, which gave last year,

Williams 800 Colby 177 Berry and Scat. 166
343—457 maj. for Williams. 177—343

Providing that these towns come in as before, Mr. Williams's majority will be 1,033; but the estimated gain will increase it to 1,100.

According to the Post, the Democrats have elected one hundred and thirty-eight members of the House, the allies one hundred and thirty-one. The Boston Atlas, however, on Saturday gave the allies one hundred and thirty-eight members.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For Standard—from March 7th, to 13th, 1847.

A. T. Lainz, Plainfield, N. J.	$2 00
Richard Warren, New-York,	1 00
Benjamin Edwards, Leonardsville, N. Y.	1 00
H. Marcellus, Edmeston, N. Y.	1 00
Truman Wood, Burlington Flats, N. Y.	1 00
Silas Burleson, Edmeston, N. Y.	1 00
Alonzo Martin, Hampton, Ct.	1 00
Wm. G. Weaver, East Greenwood, R. I.	2 64
Mary Peckham, Easton, N. Y.	1 00
David Ruggles, Northampton, Mass.	1 00
Wm. K. Wright, Phillipston, "	1 00
Wm. Farwell, Cambridgeport, "	1 00
Elijah P. Clarke, Boston, "	1 00
Wm. Ashby, Newburyport, "	1 00
Bourne Spooner, Plymouth, "	3 72
Eliakim Weller, Fowlersville, N. Y.	1 00
D. McDonald, Caledonia, N. Y.	1 00
John Davis, Hallowell, Me.	1 00
Harriett Dow, Portland, Me.	4 88
Mirriam Hussey, "	1 00
Rev. A. A. Miner, Lowell, Mass.	1 00
James Hamer, Skippackville, Pa.	1 00
P. W. Andrus, Pittsford, N. Y.	1 00
A. W. Weston, Weymouth, Mass.	50
Mrs. N. C. Fifield, "	50
Mary A. Messinger, New-York,	1 00
	34 24

Total Amount, $34 24
FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

NOTICES.

MEETINGS FOR C. L. REMOND AND J. C. HATHAWAY.

SENECA COUNTY.

Ovid, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, March 17, 18, and 19.
Farmersville, Saturday and Sunday, March 20 and 21.
Lodi, Monday and Tuesday, March 22 and 23.
Covert, Wednesday and Thursday, March 24 and 25.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.

Trumansburg, Friday and Saturday, March 26 and 27.
Ulysses, Sunday and Monday March 28 and 29.
Enfield, Tuesday and Wednesday, March 30 and 31.
Reynoldsville, Thursday and Friday, April 1 and 2.
Hector, Saturday and Sunday, April 3 and 4.
Burdette, Monday and Tuesday, April 5 and 6.

CHEMUNG COUNTY.

Catharines, Wednesday and Thursday, April 7 and 8.
Milport, Friday and Saturday, April 9 and 10.
Horse Heads, Sunday and Monday, April 11 and 12.
Elmira, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 13, 14 and 15.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.

Ludlowville, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 19, 20, and 21.

Meetings to commence at one and half-past six o'clock, P. M.

J. C. HATHAWAY.

3d mo. 9, 1847.

MEETINGS.

William W. Brown, the distinguished American slave, will lecture at the following places, as follows:

Waterloo, Sunday, March 7, at half-past 6, P. M.		
Fayetteville, Wednesday	10th	"
Cazenovia, Thursday,	11th	"
Madison, Friday,	12th	"
Bridgewater, Saturday,	13th	"
Unadilla Forks, Sunday,	14th	"

The well-known advocate of the slave's cause, Dr. E. D Hudson, will hold meetings as follows:

Unadilla Forks, Wednesday, February	24th	
Leonardsville, Thursday & Friday, February	25 & 26	
Edmeston, Saturday and Sunday,	"	27 & 28
Burlington Flats, Monday and Tuesday, March	1 & 2	
Oakville, Wednesday,	"	3
Cooperstown, Thursday and Friday,	"	4 & 5
Clarksville, Saturday and Sunday,	"	6 & 7
Middlefield, Monday and Tuesday,	"	8 & 9
Cherry Valley, Wednesday and Thursday,	"	10 & 11
Springfield, Friday and Saturday,	"	12 & 13
Little Lake, Sunday,	"	14
Richfield, Monday,	"	15

Meetings to commence at 1 and half-past 6, P. M.

W. W. Brown and Dr. Hudson will join each other on Tuesday, March 16th, and thereafter hold meetings in conjunction, as follows. The friends of the slave in the different places will not forget to anticipate their arrival, and make all the necessary arrangements for the meetings.

Litchfield, Wednesday, March	17th
Frankfort, Thursday and Friday,	18th and 19th
Mohawk, Saturday and Sunday,	20th and 21st
Herkirmer, Monday and Tuesday,

Poetry.

HIGH THOUGHTS.

BY ROBERT NICOLL.

High thoughts!
They come and go
Like the soft breathings of a listening maiden,
While round me flow
The winds from woods and fields with gladness laden;
When the corn's rustle on the ear doth come,
When the eve's beetle sounds its drowsy hum,
When the stars, dew-drops of the summer sky,
Watch over all with soft and roving eye;
While the leaves quiver,
By the lone river,
And the quiet heart
From depths doth call,
Earth grows a shadow,
Forgotten whole,
And Heaven lives
In the blessed soul.

High thoughts!
They are with me
When deep within the bosom of the forest,
Thy morning melody
Abroad into the sky thou throstle pourest;
When the young sunbeams glance among the trees,
When on the ear comes the soft song of bees,
And every branch has its own favourite bird,
And songs of summer from each bush are heard;
Where the owl flitteth,
Where the roe sitteth,
And holiness
Seems sleeping there,
While nature's prayer,
Goes up to Heaven.

High thoughts!
They are my own,
When I am resting on a mountain's bosom,
And see below me strown
The huts and homes where humble virtues blossom;
When I can trace each streamlet through the meadow,
When I can follow every fitful shadow,
When I can watch the waves among the corn,
And see the winds along the forest borne;
Where blue-bell and heather
Are blossoming together,
And far doth come
The Sabbath-bell
O'er wood and fell—
I hear the beating
Of Nature's heart;
Heaven is before me—
God, thou art!

High thoughts!
They visit me
In moments when the soul is dim and darkened;
They come to bless
After the vanities to which we hearkened,
When weariness hath come upon the spirit,
(Those hours of darkness which we all inherit.)
Bursts there not through, a glint of warm sunshine,
A winged thought which bids us not repine?
In joy and gladness,
In mirth and sadness,
Come signs and tokens:
Life's angel brings
Upon its wings
These bright communings
The soul doth keep,
Those thoughts of Heaven
So pure and deep.

From Howitt's [London] Journal.

THE VERDICT OF THE POOR.

BY EDWARD YOUL.

Sits a maid upon a stone,
Singing slow in under tone:
Comes a man across a moor,—
He is old, and lame, and poor.

"Riches are a glorious boon,
As is aught beneath the Moon."
Thus the maid, upon the stone,
Singeth slow, in under-tone.

"Not for hoarding;—daily care
Dwells where hoarded riches are:—
Not for wasting;—sinful deed
Squanders what the wretched need.

"But for giving;—God above
Gives to all men in his love.
Hoard or squander,—desperate sin
Thy sad heart hath drunken in."

Came the man across the moor,—
He was old, and lame, and poor;
And the maid upon the stone,
Spake him thus in under-tone:

"Here is gold;—the wretched feel
Miseries which the Rich can heal."
But, abashed, he hangs his head,
Asking not another's bread.

"Heav'n hath daughters—daughters three,
And one's name is Charity;
She is fair, but more I prize
Her sister of the bandaged eyes.

"Mercy treads with glorious feet;"—
Thus he makes her answer meet—
"She is fair, but most I prize
Her sister of the bandaged eyes.

"Industry will up and strive:
Idleness will never thrive:
Sluggard heart will lose its shame,
Begging alms in holy name.

"JUSTICE, for the young and old;—
Give them *that*—not rich men's gold;
Age has won its right to rest;
Honest work is young man's quest.

"JUSTICE, and no man is poor,
Though another owneth more."—
Thus the old man made reply,
Taking naught of Charity.

PSYCHE.

BY T. K. HERVEY.

They were bright fables in the days of old,
When Reason borrowed Fancy's painted wings,
When Truth's clear rill flowed over sands of gold,
And told in song its high and mystic things:—
And such the sweet and solemn tale of her,
The pilgrim heart, to whom a dream was given,
That led her through the world, Love's worshipper,
To seek on earth for him whose earth was heaven,—
As some lone angel, through night's scattered host,
Might seek a star which he had loved and lost.
In the full city, by the haunted fount,
Through the dim grotto's tracery of spars,
'Mid the fair temples, on the moonlit mount,
Where silence sits to listen to the stars,
In the deep glade where dwells the brooding dove,
The painted valley, and the scented air,
She heard far echoes of the voice of Love,
And found his footsteps' traces everywhere;—
But never more they met, since doubts and fears,
Those phantom shapes that haunt and blight the earth,
Had come 'twixt her, a child of sin and tears,
And that bright spirit of immortal birth,
Until her pining soul and weeping eyes
Had learned to seek him only in the skies;
Till wings unto the weary heart were given,
And she became Love's angel-bride in Heaven.

Miscellany.

TOUSSAINT:
AN HISTORICAL ROMANCE.

From an unpublished Translation from the German of Theodore Mügge.)

CHAPTER XVII.—[CONCLUDED.]

The little Doctor having caught the tenour of Toussaint's remarks, here rose from his seat, and raised his glass. "With your permission, my noble patron, and worthy friend of man," said he, and his red face betrayed the effects of the wine he had drank, "there spoke a man who knows nothing of the world, who, like a badger in his hole, has been brooding over things, wherewith he would set at work and tinker the handiwork of the good God. Such sour hearts fancy that nothing is in its right place, and they study with their books and dreams, to put a new and better world together. But what would the world be without a stomach? All nonsense, sheer nonsense! Tongue and stomach, there, in them you find all the springs of action; by these it is that arrange and pack men together, and mix them up with one another, and drive them to good or to evil, for without evil, there could be no good,—these it is that invent, and create, and establish order and laws, and traverse seas, and till the land, and struggle for improvement, and culture, and call in science, and life, and death. O, my worthy gentlemen, would such a thing as a physician ever be possible if mankind had no stomach? The well-organized machine would never decay, and we should have an immortality without Heaven, which is in the highest degree, blasphemous, and deserves to be punished with faggot and fire by the holy Church. And this pious zeal," he continued, casting an ironical look at the Priest, "how would it instantly cool down. Religion would be annihilated, God's throne would totter, and a horrible Atheism sieze the human race. What would become of all the little marriage fees, the penance groats, and the christening moneys, and all the absolution taxes of the worthy fathers, if the joys of the table, the pleasures of the social board were to come to an end?"

"You graceless man!" cried the Priest, tossing off his large glass. "The stomach it is that lets the devil go about seeking whom he may devour. Are you not of the accursed apostate sect, that call themselves Protestants, and who pretend to have so much to do with truth, and mind, and moderation? You glutton and guzzler, what would you have, then? Mankind, thus purified, would better suit your sectarian notions, and increase the number of your pale, half-starved, smooth-pated champions."

"I am a Protestant!" shouted the little Doctor, with great irritation, "I protest against Devil and Pope, but I love God and the world, and therefore do I love the stomach, too. Just let mankind fall asleep, and wake up some fine morning without that eternal tinkling poorsbag of human life, then you would see how long your God would be sure of creatures who, with their hunger, had lost all their humility. What is the principal prayer of all men, the true expression of all piety? Give us this day our daily bread! Strike this prayer out of the Catechism, and all the rest falls all to pieces. I can imagine I hear the cry: Down with all religion, it is a hungry world that invented it! Just as they cry now: Down with the aristocrats, down with the King! Yes, honoured Sirs, the abolition of this most vital, ancient, law for the maintenance of due obedience and submission, would be a revolution against Heaven, which would be forced to make a new Constitution, and have to prepare itself for a republic of entire liberty and equality. But we, as good Christians, faithful servants of the King, and sworn foes of all revolutions, must hold to the stomach and the palate; and, therefore, worthy Colonel, soon to have the title of Excellency, as your excellent piety right well deserves, how can that be possible without a good, sound stomach, able to resist unshaken all attacks?"

"Our friend," returned Toussaint, with a quiet smile, "begins already to fear a diminution of his patients, from the bad example of moderation set by a single individual. But never mind, Master Bertrand, the world as it goes onward, departs always more and more from simple, natural habits of life, and this Island, with its black inhabitants, who have hitherto given the doctors very little to do, will soon suffer all the diseases of civilization."

"That it is," cried the physician, with a gratified air, "which makes this Insurrection so valuable. What profound observations are to be made, what new diseases will arise from new modes of life, from luxury, change of food, climate, labour, and a thousand other things, not to mention remarkable cases of wounds, which in these half-savages, manifest very different symptoms from those which appear in the civilized man."

"Among these dear children of nature," said La Haye, with a mixed expression of irony and seriousness, "all is sound and healthy, the flesh, like the spirit, which, in simplicity and meekness, bows before the servants of God, submits in like manner to the physician, as to a sacred personage, even though he kills them by inches with his magical doses."

"Ha," cried the Doctor, "could I only once get at the foxes in sheep's clothing with my knives and my doses, the holy gentlemen of Port-au-Prince, for example, who have now, for the second time reconciled Rigaud and his yellow-skinned comrades to the whites. Those spiritual doctors, who, down there in the West and South, are so eager to keep the blacks fast bound, are the true subjects for you, reverend Sir. You, you who write books in behalf of universal freedom, and do all the writing for his Excellency, Jean François, and those, who preach Slavery, are they not all servants of one and the same religion and love? Read me this riddle, holy Sir. Yesterday, there flew a mocking-bird over this way, and cried through the woods. Would you know, good people, why there are so many white Priests among the rebels? In the North they have lost the greater part of their incomes, and now they join here different parties of blacks, and share the plunder like the worthy Priest of Limbé, who accompanied the brave General Biasson, before whose troops a white child was carried, stuck upon a pike, for a standard. This holy man, the Creoles caught, and hung him up; but the rest are more cunning; they only write and advise, and then share the spoil."

Here the malicious little man suddenly fell silent, for Toussaint threw towards him, a stern and commanding look, and then rose from the table, thus forcing all to follow his example. The doors were then thrown open and the company passed into a cool, lofty room, where dancing was begun, the little Doctor taking his seat at a harpsichord, upon which he played to the great delight of the negroes, although the discords, which he produced not only by false notes, but by mingling up three or four half-forgotten tunes, were to Vincent as ridiculous as they were horrible.

Toussaint, however, soon withdrew with his guest to an adjoining room, where the Priest of Dondon was already seated, looking over various letters and papers, which he read and considered with great attention. Toussaint caressed and kissed his children, whom he played with on his knees. Vincent remarked that the oldest boy was of a much lighter complexion than the others, and was convinced that he could not be Toussaint's son, although he seemed to be regarded with even more fondness than the younger ones. "It is the son of my wife," said the negro, "a child of her first husband; but he is dear to me, this poor Isaac, he shall never want a father. Could I only accomplish it," he continued, with evident emotion, "to procure an education for these poor children. O, how I thirst to have them away out of this horrible war, out of this wilderness, and to open to their young hearts the gates of wisdom. My dear friend, you have to-day, witnessed a scene that appears to separate us forever from our country, from France, but, ah! it was absolutely necessary, it was an act, which, as I told you beforehand, has been long in preparation, and must come. We have become Spaniards, because France has thrust us out. Let her open her arms to us, and the day will be in readiness, when we,"—here he paused, and cast a look at the Priest of Dondon, who turned from the papers and returned the look—"when we will solemnize our reconciliation."

"Your banners," said Vincent, gravely, "bear the inscription, 'Freedom or death! Long live the King!' Do you know what you are about when you join yourselves to these proud Spaniards, who want to use you for their purposes, for the conquest of this Island, as the monkey used the cat to get the nuts out of the fire?"

A smile passed across the features of Toussaint. "We shall see," said he, "our holy religion commands us to trust to the words of her servants, and to the Kings of the earth. Whatever happens, it is the will of God!"

"Holy Virgin!" cried the Priest of Dondon, looking up from his papers, "here it is, a reinforcement of six thousand men from Martinique and Europe, has arrived, led by Generals Laveaux and Rochambau, and there's a new Commission too, Alibaud! Polverel and Santonax, who are to proclaim universal emancipation."

"And this moment," exclaimed Vincent, will you miss? Now, when freedom beckons to you, when France proclaims it for you, will you make common cause with Spain?"

Toussaint smiled and shook his head, and pointed up to heaven. "There is a fierce storm brewing up there," said he, "and before it is spent the poor slaves will see their rights and liberties acknowledged. New Commissaries will come, but they will find the same opposition as the old ones. What have Messrs. Mirbec, Raume, and St. Leger effected? And yet they had the best will, to help us. The instant these furious Creoles are humbled, who cannot forget that we were their slaves, then will rise the sun of freedom, and then," and this he whispered in Vincent's ear, "then it will be a pleasure to call oneself a Frenchman."

"Oho!" cried La Haye, "then it is really true that the agreement with Rigaud is again, the second time, concluded and ratified. Several Priests and the rich young Jumecourt have arranged the matter. The eighteen articles are yielded to the free mulattoes."

"I will bless the day," said Toussaint, "when they appear as free citizens in the assemblies of the white, but I do not believe in it."

"Disturbances in all corners," exclaimed La Haye, reading on. "In several quarters, where the whites are the strongest, the mulattoes have been massacred, and in other places, the whites. The fury is boundless, so they write. Fathers murder their sons, and sons their fathers, for opinion's sake. They make frightful alliances, in order to destroy one another's friends and kindred; all order, all the laws of natures are annihilated."

"And which is the better of the two," said Toussaint, "the rude black man, or these rich cultivated people? There are many examples of masters saved by their slaves, but not one instance is there in which the revenge of the mulattoes or the hatred of a Creole has been softened."

"Holy Virgin!" cried the Priest, "it is dreadful. From Port-au-Prince, the mulattoes have been driven with violence. The savage Patolo, the Marquis de Borel, Baron Dumortier have had bloody engagements, at the head of the National Guards and soldiers. The city is nearly all burnt down, and the Governor, de Blanchelande has gone to the West, to help the mulattoes; would one believe it, Col. Toussaint, I say: to help the mulattoes, against the Creoles."

"May Heaven be with him," replied the negro quietly.

"And these cruel Creoles," cried La Haye. "They write here that the Marquis de Borel has gathered bands of soldiers, saltwork labourers, custom-house officers, and even black runaways, from the mountains, to fight against the mulattoes; but the mulattoes do the same; they have armed their slaves who are forced to strengthen their ranks."

"Negro against negro," said Toussaint. "I am certain, they will not spare one another, for the son of nature knows no policy, and in Africa they always exterminate their foes."

"And finally the black insurgents, in the high mornes of Lahotte," continued the Priest. "In those dark chasms which are often all but inaccessible, numbers of runaway slaves are collected, who under their leaders, Hyacinth and Jean Kina make the whole South and West unsafe, and murder mulattoes and whites."

"Thus it is that men destroy one another," said Toussaint, with great emotion, "brothers of one stock, and born, as holy men say, to love one another. O! why, thou Almighty Lord of the world, why dost not thou enlighten thy children, why must the poor outcasts pursue their way through blood and cruelty to obtain the right; why must hatred and contempt fill the hearts where Love alone should dwell?" The speaker covered his brow with his hand and sighed, but suddenly he raised himself proudly and calmly up, and in a strong voice continued: "But we need not ask such questions, for we cannot change it. It must be so, that is enough. Yes, let us strive to bring on the day, and disperse the night. Deliverance will come at last. Then virtue will triumph and all evil spirits be destroyed. A new world shall bloom, and peace shall come, and strong right which will enlighten all souls. O, holy God! if it is to be so, if thy servant may see that day, when his people shall enjoy their sacred rights, when this plain shall grow green again, and bloom, when free men shall here pluck the rich fruit, when my children, my dear children, shall surround me, happy and honoured, and growing in wisdom, esteemed by their associates, by the free citizens of the land, without regard to colour; when I—when I."—He trembled under the fullness of the thoughts which rushed upon his soul, his eyes glanced with a sacred fire, and his tongue ceased its utterance.

"When thou," cried Vincent, throwing his arms around him, "when thou, my friend and brother, shall stand a priest of virtue, and the first of his people before the altar of the God of freedom, then let me be the first white man who offers thee his homage, and confesses at thy feet that Africa produces nobler heroes than Europe."

Toussaint rested his old head thoughtfully on the breast of the enthusiastic youth. "I am almost an old man," said he, painfully, "shall I live till my star reaches the highest heaven? I shall!" cried he. "I see far onward, it will be so."

"My dear son, if you will take the counsel of an old man, a servant of God," said the Priest, rising from his seat, "hear, Colonel Toussaint, what I say. "Quit the Spaniards, come to an understanding with the Commissary of the National Convention, Santonax, with General de la Veaux, who is an ardent friend of freedom. I myself and this young officer—"

"Hush," said Toussaint with great seriousness, "say no more reverend father. I am no traitor, to forsake my friends in need. Ha! I know these Spaniards, but we will see. By the holy mother of God!"—and here he crossed himself devourly—"I am a good Christian, and faithful to the cause, to which I have sworn."

This singular and sudden change of manner and speech startled the Priest, and Vincent no less. Hastily, and with a disturbed air, Toussaint turned to the window and looked sharply out. Amidst the music and noise of the dancers, came quite different sounds from the mountains opposite. In a few moments all doubt was dissipated. It was the noise of fire-arms echoing through the valley, and every moment approaching nearer.

Suddenly a black rider appeared rushing toward the house. It was Moses, who burst in, sword in hand, and with flashing eye. The music ceased. The black ladies crowded in alarm together, and the men called for their arms, and their cry was answered from without by fleeing women and children who come running from the valley towards the house.

"Uncle," shouted Moses, "they come, they are upon us from all sides. From Dondon, from Grand Rivière, from about Dauphin and Limbé. Up, up! they have surrounded us. I have seen the glancing of their arms, and their long lines as I stood up there, and looked toward the camp of Tannerie. JeanFrangois is attacked, he retreats, and we are all lost."

"And do you so soon lose heart?" said Toussaint, quietly. "Collect our friends," he continued, "preserve order, let the sick, who are able, hide themselves instantly in the woods; the stronger must help carry the weak. We have time enough."

A heavy discharge of artillery accompanied his last words, and a bomb burst over the house. And then was heard the shout of the whites on the edge of the woods opposite, and the noise of musketry. With every moment the confusion became greater. The deadly effect of the bomb-shells was known by the blacks only too well, and a universal flight drew them out toward the mountains behind the house, and which bordered on the Spanish quarter.

"Away, worthy Sir," said Toussaint to the Priest, "there beyond the mountains lies a long chain of forest, which no European ventures to penetrate. Thither shall you accompany my young friend Vincent and the members of my family. Sure guides shall protect you and lead you safe into the Spanish district."

"No, my son," replied La Haye, with decision, "not so." I will remain here in my parish, where God's will has placed me to feed my flock."

"But the flock," cried Toussaint, "will turn upon the Shepherd, pious father."

"The will of Heaven be done," said the Priest. "I have taken the part of the oppressed, have served them in word and deed, have laboured for them and told the National Assembly what I think—all this I will not deny. But your Spanish alliance I hate from my inmost soul, although I have had to assist in it. I am a Frenchman, body and soul, and since I know that you are resolved to sell your country, you may go and repent, for repentance will come. But I will not quit this spot, for that would make me a traitor."

"Stay, then," cried Toussaint, after a pause, "and you, M. Vincent, do you remain; you are now free and may await your friends. Protect each other from their rage and hearken to one word," added he, softly: "If Citizen Commissary Santonax, or Polverel, or General de la Veaux should chance to say to the black citizens: 'Come to us and you shall be free and equal with us,' tell them that Toussaint Breda hearkens to what they say. Farewell, and away! Fear not, my friend Vincent, our wishes will be realized."

He hastened out, and in a few moments Vincent and La Haye saw the whole family of Toussaint escaping by wild paths in all their European ornaments, which were now more cumbersome than ever. Some speedily relieved themselves of the awkward burden of their dresses, before the thorns and briars of the underwood had performed for them the office of chamberlains, and Vincent could not suppress a smile, when he saw the ladies old and young mingled among the fugitives, and now stripped of all the tokens of their rank. But soon his pity was awakened in the liveliest manner. The weary sick appeared, dragging themselves along, while some sank down, crying for help, and amidst the thunder of the fight and the shouts of Toussaint's soldiers, who formed all round the hill, a line of defence, was heard the mournful cry of those who were left in the hospitals, for the shrill voice of the little Doctor could command no assistance. Soon balls whistled by; and soldiers in blue coats turned up with red, and with three-cornered hats adorned with huge tri-coloured cockades, rushed forward with huzzas, driving the black combatants before them. Vincent shouted for joy at the sight of his friends. "France! Freedom!" cried he, embracing the Priest. "Priest of Baal!" shouted the little Doctor in at the window, "away with you, if you have whole bones, and you too, my young Sir, flee with us, these good friends are like the rats, they devour each other." He had not time to finish his speech, for his Famulus rushed upon him. "Off with you, silly doctor," cried he, seizing the little man like a feather. The next moment Valsain was running toward the wood with the little man on his shoulders. Master Bertrand held fast with great care, to a large bunch of plants, which he had under his arm, together with plasters and surgical instruments, while he continued almost weeping to enlarge to his panting bearer upon the immense loss which his patients must suffer from this shameful attack of the whites, who had now spoilt all his pains, and would back and hew and kill all those who were as he said, to owe their lives to his skill. But Valsain suddenly stopped and broke out into a horrible laugh, while he pointed to the buildings. "They are all taken care of!" cried he, "good souls, these Congos, a brave man must take pity, Master Bertrand. Nobody will kill them now, no one shall injure the poor blacks. "Oh, fy, fy!" and with that he ran off like a maniac into the woods, regardless of the cries of the Doctor, just as a thick pillar of smoke and a thousand tongues of flames burst forth from the out-houses.

Vincent perceived the fire, as with frightful rapidity it darted from the windows up over the palm thatched roof; and the cry of mortal agony, from so many poor wretches rose above the uproar of the fight. With convulsive force he grasped the arm of the Priest, and pointed to the blazing buildings.

"Domine vobiscum!" cried La Haye, "but it is not the worst thing which has happened and will happen here. Whether burnt to death or stabbed with bayonets it is all one in the end, yes, and perhaps this way of deliverance is easy, when one recollects how only a few days ago, our educated white friends ripped open their black prisoners like so many fishes, and then put powder into their wounds and set fire to it. But come this way, I hear them in the house, and our business is to save one's own body." So saying, he dragged Vincent into the little cabinet. In a few minutes the frail door of the saloon was burst open by the blows of muskets, the tables and furniture shivered into atoms, a frantic, blood-thirsty gang were raging for new victims, and had it not been for the caution of the Priest in concealing himself and his companion, they would probably both have been slain on the spot. The moment Vincent caught the sounds of a commanding voice, he opened the half-shattered door, and with a cry of joy and deliverance, threw himself into the midst of a company of officers who just then entered the house. At their head was a general officer, an elderly man, who was followed by a tall, commanding personage, with a tri-coloured sash, blue coat, and sabre in hand.

"A white man! a citizen officer!" cried the soldiers, observing Vincent's torn uniform, the only thing that indicated his rank.

"Vincent!" cried Col. Touzard, who just then appeared, "my brave fellow I told you so; you would not be killed. A man like you is meant for something better."

"Who is this officer?" asked the tall man in the blue coat, while he cast a gloomy, suspicious look upon the Colonel.

"M. de St. Vincent," replied Touzard, "one of my most active and skilful officers, M. Santonax."

"Citizen Vincent, you mean, Citizen Touzard," cried the tall man. "And who is this citizen in black, behind Citizen Vincent?"

"Citizen Commissary," said the Priest, while he proudly cocked his three-cornered hat, and placed one arm akimbo, "you see here the Priest of Dondon, the Citizen La Haye, who, six months ago, addressed to the General Assembly, a letter, in which he declared himself for the freedom of all men, the blacks of course included."

Some of the officers present, of the National Guard of the Cape, and members of the General Assembly, and belonging to the richest class, fell, at these words, into indescribable rage. "Hang this scoundrel up," cried the Baron of St. Domingo, "General de la Veaux, Citizen Commissary, we hope that you will punish this old rebel on the spot."

"And what have I done?" said La Haye, with dignity. "I took the part of the oppressed, and I acted for them in the name of freedom, in the name of God, and of the holy religion, whose servant I am."

"Worthless Priest!" shouted the Creole, "was it not you who advised them to put the name of Louis Capet on their colours,—you, who with your worthy associates, persuaded them to league themselves with Spaniards?"

"Upon this point," replied the Priest, "Citizen Vincent here can best testify. I say it frankly, I am a friend of the negroes, as a Priest should be, and every friend of freedom. The rest I deny. Were my conscience not clear," he continued, "I should have followed the flying blacks. But here I stand, strong in a good cause, and cry, 'my country forever, for whose weal I will live and die.'"

It was evident that the old General de la Veaux as well as the Commissary of the Convention, took a lively interest in the brave Priest, who perfectly understood the advantage he had got. To the powerful party of the Creoles, no open resistance was to be made, for they represented the majority of the white population, although the Jacobin spirit of freedom reigned among the lowest classes; but the new Deputies had appeared to open the way to freedom, to proclaim human rights, and in the officers and soldiers, whom they brought with them, glowed the the same purposes, and hatred of the arrogant distinctions insisted on by the Creoles. When the Baron of St. Domingo angrily repeated his demand, Santonax pointed to his tri-coloured sash, and said, with all his characteristic pride of office: "Citizen Domingo, these colours are emblems of justice, freedom, and equality. They exclude all revenge. Citizen General, in the name of the Convention, arrest these two citizens, whom we have found here. Let them be conducted to the Cape, to my associate Polverel, who will examine them, and act accordingly."

The proud Baron was chagrined in two ways. His nobility was insulted, and his dignity as a member of the National Assembly.

"If you, M. Commissary, do not immediately decide the case of this traitor, it is the affair of the National Assembly, at the Cape, to pronounce judgment. In the name of the same, I protest against any other jurisdiction."

"In the name of the Convention, in the name of the Republic:" shouted Santonax, sternly. "Citizen Domingo, there are here neither Barons nor gentlemen, but I deputy Sontonax, of the Convention, am sent to establish right and order, which are hardly known here any longer."

"Do as you please!" cried the Baron, in the greatest wrath, "but we have our eyes open, and see everything that is done. Take care, M. Deputy, how you touch our rights."

"Take care of yourself," roared Santonax, "aye, take care of yourselves, you, who dishonour the sacred name of citizens; France wills the freedom, not of a caste, but of all mankind."

General de la Veaux, seeing that this scene might have bad consequences, quickly put an end to it. "Citizen Anatole," cried he, to one of his aids, "in the name of the Republic! arrest these citizens, and off with them to the Cape. The top of the ridge is cleared," he continued, "and here the fire is close upon us. Citizen Major Domingo, betake yourself to your division."

As Vincent and the Priest were about to depart with a small troop of dragoons, Col. Touzard, pressing Vincent's hand, whispered to him with a smile as he bade him goodbye, "Made prisoner, as you are, both by black rogues and white ones, still they will let you go." Then lowering his voice still more, he added. "Tell M. de Charmilly to give his friend Blanchelande a hint that the Saratoga Springs, in America, are excellent for all sorts of disease. I shall go try those springs myself, soon. I feel a twinge about the vertebra of my neck, that awakens in me the worst fears."

Quickly, and with a look full of meaning, he left Vincent's side, and the troops set themselves in motion. But La Haye, who had caught the last words of the Colonel, laid his hand upon his own neck, and observed: "I have had an ugly feeling about my neck for a long while, but may the holy Mother of God protect these worthy Deputies of the Convention; they have come in the nick of time, and will not let me lose my voice."

(To be continued.)

ALEXANDER DUMAS.

The following article, which we find in the Boston Daily Advertiser, will be read with pleasure. Those sensitive ladies and gentlemen who delight themselves with Dumas' novels are not accustomed probably to picture to themselves the writer with "a brown complexion, and crisped hair." The Marquis de la Pailleterre, the friend of the Duke de Montpensier, the only Frenchman permitted to be present at the marriage of the Spanish princess, the wearer of the grand cordon of Charles III. and the badge of Nichan, who received distinctions only paid to princes, in *this* country would be kicked from the quarter deck of steamboats, from the first class cars, from the boxes of the theatres, or the parlours of the hotels, as a *nigger!* Such is the difference between the most aristocratic nation of Europe, and the half-civilized African, and the most enlightened and Christian Republic:

The late Paris papers contain an account of an interesting trial which was going on at the close of January, in which Dumas was defending himself against several publishers of journals, who complained that he had not fulfilled his engagements with them. Dumas undertook the management of his own case, and the interest felt in this popular writer drew together an immense crowd to hear the trial. Long before the opening of the doors of the Court, all the entrances to it were besieged, and the hall was at once filled, says the Debats, with an audience as distinguished as it was numerous. The Court on opening was occupied in another case, but this being disposed of, the cause of Messrs. Girardin and Veron against Alexander Dumas, and the *Siecle, Patrie*, and *Commerce* newspapers, and M. Dumas entered the Hall. He was immediately recognized by his *brown complexion*, his *crisped hair*, the elegance of his dress, and his ease of manner. He had difficulty in forcing his way through the dense crowd to his seat in the bar, where he was to plead his own cause.

The Counsel for the *Commerce* opened the case, by reciting the contract that journal had made with Dumas, and the inconveniences to which its editors had been subjected, in consequence of the non-fulfilment of it. Dumas rose in reply, and read some of the most important articles of this contract, calling particular attention to the last clause, which provided that these articles should take effect only on condition that a previous contract which he had made with another party should be first settled either amicably, or by *a decision* of the Court. This last settlement was not made till January, 1846. The following summary of the engagements he had entered into with his various publishers, shows that the affair and his obligations were somewhat complicated. By this contract, which was made May 28, 1845, he agreed to furnish the editors of the Constitutionnel with nine volumes of romance; either one romance in four volumes, or two in two volumes or three romances in three volumes each, the form to be settled by mutual agreement. He had also made agreements to furnish for the *Debats*, the conclusion of Monte Cristo; thirty thousand lines Bragelone, for the *Siecle;* thirty-six thousand lines, Maison Rouge, for the *Democratie;* twenty-four thousand lines, for the *Commerce;* and with other journals to the amount of one hundred and seventy-five thousand lines.

"I had," added Dumas, "two years in which to write these volumes, at the rate of eighty thousand lines a year. I defy the gentlemen of the French Academy to do as much, and there are forty of them." "In fact, gentlemen, I was very busy in fulfilling my engagements with all these journals. I did what no one else does or will do, I kept up the publication of five romances in five different journals."

While busied this way, the editor of the Constitutionnel came to Dumas in great distress, and told him that his paper would certainly fail if he could not furnish him with one of his romances to keep it up. Dumas said to him, "eight days is enough for a volume when one has nothing else to do, but it is impossible when one is carrying on at the same time five romances in as many different papers. I devote all my time at St. Germain to this, I send the manuscript by railroad. My servant is constantly employed in carrying back and forth the proofs. I have followed this trade for three years."

Notwithstanding this, he yielded to the urgency of the editor, and turned him out at once a romance of six thousand lines.

Dumas then gives an account of his further dealings with his various publishers, which become very complicated from the various law-suits which arose from their different claims. It is impossible to form or give a clear account of these conflicting claims, nor would it be worth the trouble.

While matters were in a somewhat confused state Dumas received an invitation from the Duke de Montpensier, to accompany him to Spain on the occasion of his marriage, which invitation was too flattering to be declined. The following is the concluding part of the defence of Dumas in his own words, as reported in the *Debats*. The case was not decided at the last dates.

"Gentlemen, I have the contract under my eye, and it will be my best answer. The Court will see from this document, that it is stated that the time of publication should be fixed by mutual agreement, and that in the month of July, I could not be held to furnish the five volumes that were demanded of me. At the time I wrote the Dame de Monsoreau, which they reproach me with having written by bribery and furnished by piecemeal, I had, it will be remembered, five romances going on in numbers, and I ought, it seems to me, to be thanked for having done as much as I did.

"These gentlemen pretend that in my charming villa of St. Germain, I sate with my arms folded for four months, from August to October! Undoubtedly while I was making the eight volumes of Balsamo, the last of which appeared only eight days before I went to Spain—I was, they say, witnessing the performances at the same time, of Shakspeare and Dumas. It is true, that I did so, in my leisure moments, and such recreation is not so out of the line of art, that people who are half artists need reproach me with it. I, at least, might be allowed it, who have produced the number of lines you know I have, in two months and a half.

"As to my journey to Spain—no; I have never solicited anything; I did not know I was to go there, only the Duke de Montpensier, who has shown me some kindness, had addressed me in the same language as his brother, who said to me, 'Come to Versailles, you and M. Hugo; it is important you should be present at a festival consecrated to the memory of our national glory.'

"M. Salvandy sent for me. 'Can you go to Spain and Algeria?' said he. 'This,' replied I, "happens very conveniently, for I am ill, and I need a journey.' 'You shall go to Spain,' resumed the Minister, 'you shall be present at the marriage. You shall go to Algeria, to visit the finest country in the world, a country altogether unknown, especially to our deputies, who though called to speak of it every day, know nothing about it, and who have the greatest need of light upon this subject. A popular, fruitful, original talent is wanted (it is the Minister who is speaking,) to teach them what is in Algeria," (laughter among the audience.) These are the words of M. Salvandy. One would not attribute such words to a Minister unless he himself uttered them.

"I went then to Spain, and was so much of a guest that I was the only Frenchman present at the private marriage. It was on that occasion that I received the grand cordon of Charles III. which was given, not to the author, but to the man, to me, Alexander Dumas Davey, Marquis de la Pailleterre, the friend of the Duke de Montpensier.

"After these ceremonies I went to Tunis. The Tunisian Prince was then at Paris, but in his absence, I was not the less brilliantly received as the envoy of France by his brother, the second master of the empire. He is a half savage, but he is a very amiable man; he hung on my neck the badge of Nichan. I was so much occupied with literary pursuits, that I collected there some most curious documents, and in the space of four days I shall deposite at the bar of the Court a whole volume written by my own hand.

"For my voyage to Tunis, the Governor placed at my disposition *Le Veloce*, a vessel of 220 horse power, which has been only in my service and that of the Emperor of Tunis. It is a favour granted only to princes and friends. We touched on the coast of Africa (here the voice of M. Dumas became stronger, and he spoke with a kind of inspiration) when I learned that our prisoners could be restored to liberty by a prompt intervention on my part. There were twelve heads in question, (emotion of various kinds,) twelve heads which might be cut off in a single day, there were brave officers of our army there, unfortunate captives, one of them a woman, the remainder of two hundred prisoners who had escaped the massacre of Sidi-Brahim. Well, it was I, who with Le Veloce, which was placed under my direction hastened to the deliverance of Cognord and his brave companions. I conducted them in my vessel, not to Tunis, to which I was bound, but to Melitta. There three thousand persons offered me a banquet, the recollection of which repays me for the injuries I have received here. They demand of me here 50,000 francs damages for having folded my arms as they call it, I who have saved from the sword of the enemy twelve fellow-countrymen.

"It has been said that the mission was solicited. Ah, well, would you know how I went? I started with 10,000 francs which was allowed me by the minister of public instruction. I took with me six persons who represented the art of painting as I represented literature. Was there in this 10,000 francs wherewith to defray our expenses. I was compelled to sell by Regnard 50,000 francs worth of railroad shares—on which I lost 7,000 francs. I spent on this journey 26,000 francs of my own money, beside the 10,000 allowed by M. Salvandy, and 1,000 francs which I took up at Algiers, on the credit opened to me there. On my return I went to see M. Salvandy in his cabinet, and insisted on his receiving back this 1,000 francs. This is all the answer I shall make."

Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

BOTH MAY BE RIGHT.—A person residing in the neighbourhood of Preston, who entered into the matrimonial state *five days ago*, has been so far initiated into the enjoyments of wedded life, as to avow that "if all the water in the world was ink, all the land paper, and every tree upon it a pen, they would hardly be sufficient to write down the deceit of woman." We (*Preston Chronicle*) fancy he has "caught a tartar." We (*Gateshead Observer*) fancy she has caught an ass.—*Jerrold's Weekly.*

The following is affixed to a shop newly erected near the Ordnance Arms, in North street, Leeds: "*This Ouse 2 Lett. Hinquir Necks Door.*"

SALINE DEPASTURAGE OF SHEEP.—"One of the most essential ingredients employed by nature, for the due preservation of the health of both men and animals, is the muriate of soda, or common salt; and so important is it, that it has been considered necessary to combine considerable quantities of salt in the preparation of the different varieties of our food—in fact, it is on record that the Sovereign of one of the petty German States, by way of inflicting punishment on his State prisoners, ordered their bread to be prepared without salt; and the result was, that the unhappy victims were soon afflicted with intestinal worms, and other maladies incidental to the alimentary canal. Besides, if further proofs were required of the necessity there exists for it, we find that those animals which feed in the natural saltmarshes of Romney, Lynn, Pevensey, &c. &c. are much superior in appearance, and their flesh is firmer, more nutritious, and finer flavoured and better in condition, than those which graze upon lands which are, to a great extent, deficient in this valuable article. All animals are fond of salt."—*The Plough.*

Captain Knox, who boasts having enjoyed the personal acquaintance of Goethe, has translated "Faust" in a manner, say the critics, bearing favourable comparison with the translations of Dr. Anster and Mr. Hayward.

The *Athenæum* exposes a practice which, it seems, prevails largely in England. The rage for appearing in print has given rise to a regular system of literary swindling, by which an incompetent person may purchase a fair amount of literary reputation by paying for and publishing *as their own* the works of others. This nefarious trade is so fully recognized that in the journal denouncing it, we find an advertisement addressed to "literary gentlemen" in which the advertiser, after announcing himself as the author of several works, to which he refers for evidence of his ability, "undertakes the critical revisal and correction of manuscripts; or will make the reputation of a literary aspirant in any branch of the belles lettres, by wholly executing the contemplated work."

MR. DISRAELI.—It is rumoured that Mr. Disraeli has been retained for the next session, to discharge the same functions in the British Parliament on behalf of the Mexican Government that Mr. Roebuck did on behalf of the Canadian Liberals. On the closing day of last session, it will be remembered, he made out an exceedingly strong case for the interference of Great Britain in restraining United States' aggression on the more defenceless republic; evincing an intimacy with the political, commercial, and even personal history of the latter power much too minute to be the result of a desultory reading even so discursive as his. It was surmised at the time, that "he spoke by the card," and that conjecture is strongly corroborated by the report now alluded to.

THE FACE.—"We, that is I and he, find upon a human face, when it is old, the notched counting-stick of severe sorrows which have so rudely passed over it, and when it is young, it appears to us like a blooming flower-bed on the slope of a volcano, whose next eruption will overwhelm it with destruction. Ah! either the future or the past is written on the face, and makes